FORUM

Vol. CIV, No. 2 and Column Review

CAN WOMEN HOLD THEIR JOBS?
Gladys L. Palmer

TAXES: THE TREASURY VIEW
Alzada Comstock

LABOR'S ROLE IN RECONVERSION
Mark Starr

DIVORCED IN RENO?
Paul W. Tappan

RECEIVED
MAY 18 1946
SAN MATEO COUNTY
FREE LIBRARY

ORUM: SHALL WE RETAIN THE JAPANESE EMPEROR? (With documentary references)

THE THEATRE ARTS
John Gassner

POETRY
David Morton

BOOKS IN BRIEF
Jasper R. Lewis

HIGHLIGHTING THE NEWS

COLUMNS BY
George Fielding Eliot
Richard T. Harding
Jay Franklin

—And other articles and columns

25c a copy OCTOBER, 1945 $3 a year

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FORUM

OCTOBER, 1945

Volume CIV Number 2

Divorced in Reno—But not in New York ..... Paul W. Tappan 97
II-From Collective Bargaining to Planning and Control ..... Mark Starr 103
Can Our Cities Buy at the "Lowest and Best" Price? .... Reuben W. Borough 108
The Re-Education of Germany: An American Experiment ..... Frederick H. Cramer 114
Is Full Employment Possible? ..... Morley G. Dilke 120
Taxes: The Treasury View ..... Alzada Comstock 125
Women in the Post-War Labor Market ..... Gladys L. Palmer 130
An Unreconstructed Old-Timer ..... Charles Fisher 135
Peace as a Common Enterprise ..... Barnet Nover 137
Peace! ..... Anne O'Hare McCormick 139
Offensive for the Future ..... Major George Fielding Eliot 141
Atoms and Property Rights ..... Jay Franklin 142
Forum: Shall We Retain the Japanese Emperor? .. A. Craemer and M. Strong 144
Can German Youth Be Saved? ..... Louis Clair 158
The Occupation of Japan ..... Sidney Shallet 162
Dead Are Brought Back to Life ..... Albert Deutsch 165
Pompeii's Streets Were Paved with Glass ..... Richard T. F. Harding 166
Psychology Didn't Win the War ..... "Topics of the Times" 168
Poetry ..... David Morton 170
The Theatre Arts ..... John Gassner 171
Books in Brief ..... Jasper R. Lewis 176
Classics and the Censor ..... Sidney J. Harris 181
Editorialingo: The Blame for Pearl Harbor 182
Highlighting the News 186

Indexed in *The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*

Editor
D. G. REDMOND

Associate Editor
CAROL THOMPSON

Assistant Editor
CHARLOTTE E. BRAUN

Editorial Assistants
ALICE R. CRAEMER
ALICE B. McGINTY
MARY KATHARINE STRONG

25 cents a copy
3 dollars a year

Canada 3 dollars fifty cents a year.
Foreign 4 dollars a year.

Published monthly by Events Publishing Company, Inc., 135 South Second Street, Philadelphia 6, Pa. Editorial Office, 135 South Second Street, Philadelphia 6, Pa. Entered as second class matter at the Post Office in Philadelphia, Pa . March 27, 1935, under the act of March 3, 1879. Individual copies may be secured by writing to the publication office. No responsibility is assumed for the return of unsolicited manuscripts. Copyright, 1945, by Events Publishing Company, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FORUM

and Column Review

Vol. CIV OCTOBER, 1945 No. 2

Migratory Divorces May Be Held Illegal

Divorced in Reno – But Not in New York

By Paul W. Tappan

Visiting Assistant Professor in Criminology, General Sociology and Anthropology, New York University

ARE you a bigamist? And are your children illegitimate? Is your present domestic arrangement meretricious and adulterous in the eyes of the law? Are you a deserter with actual but unfulfilled marital obligations? These are some of the questions raised by the recent Supreme Court decision in *Williams v. North Carolina.* That they are not merely questions of technical significance to attorneys is made abundantly clear by the felony convictions for bigamous co-habitation in North Carolina of two individuals who were divorced in Nevada from their respective spouses and married validly under the laws of that state. There is likewise a more recent holding of the Domestic Relations Court in New York City in *Kurski v. Kurski* holding a Florida divorce invalid and its parties still bound in marital obligations. Mr. Justice Black emphasized the potential magnitude of the problem in his dissent to the Williams opinion when he said, "Statistics indicate that approximately five million divorced persons are scattered throughout the forty-eight states. More than 85 per cent of these divorces were granted in uncontested proceedings. Not one of this latter group can now retain any feeling of security in his divorce decree. Ever present will be the danger of criminal prosecution and harassment. . . . Uncontested divorce decrees are thus so degraded that a person who marries in reliance upon them can be sent to jail."

Put in brief and simplest form, the Supreme Court has found that any "migratory" divorce may be attacked on the ground that the state court granting such decree lacked jurisdictional power in the case because of the divorcee's failure to establish a true and valid domicil there. The decree may thus be repudiated in another

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

state even though the court of the first had itself found the party's domicil to be adequate and its jurisdiction, therefore, valid to grant the decree. In legal terms this does not deny the requirement of full faith and credit to judicial acts between states: for the "jurisdictional fact" of domicil upon which rests a court's power to adjudicate may be questioned and denied in another state, thus indirectly upsetting a decision which could not be rejected directly. Thus, in theory, no criticism is directed at the methods or the result where another court has exercised jurisdiction, but the jurisdiction itself—the power to hear the case—is protested.

Peculiar results ensue: In the state which grants a divorce to a migrant, its decree continues valid, for it has found its jurisdiction warranted; hence the party may remarry there and beget offspring legitimate there. His prior marital obligations are at an end. Yet if he return to the state of his prior residence, its courts may find that his temporary domicil was false and fraudulent, simply designed to procure a divorce, that the decree is therefore invalid. He then owes continuing marital obligations to his former spouse; any subsequent marriage and propagation are non-legitimate, criminal. Theoretically any state other than that which granted the decree might thus nullify it—or declare it to be valid. Neither petitioner nor respondent could rely upon the validity of the foreign decree. Indeed, it is a question—not answered in the Williams decision — whether reliance would be justified even if the respondent had appeared in the case to insure jurisdiction. One's marital (and criminal) status now comes to depend upon factors of geography and mobility. One's rights and duties of person and property, present and future, rest upon the issue of past, temporary domicil, an issue that is imponderable, tenuous, loosely-defined.

Domicil is not a strange new issue to the courts, of course. For years it has been a vexing question in domestic relations, taxation, corporations, and other cases. Yet in the area of family status, matters of most serious social and moral significance are involved. In an age of frequent and extensive mobility, when marital relationships are already very unstable and threaten to become considerably more so, it is serious that our rules of law should contribute to the uncertainty and instability. No prior decision from the highest court has so unsettled the status of divorces and marriages.

WHAT CONSTITUTES DOMICIL?

According to Justice Frankfurter in the Williams decision, domicil implies a nexus between person and place *of such permanence as to control the creation of legal relations and responsibilities* of the utmost significance. It is obvious that Nevada considers six weeks to be a sufficient permanence of such nexus in the ordinary case—and has so prescribed in its sta-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tute; to its courts a domicil of merely six weeks is not a sham. North Carolina, on the other hand, with a relatively conservative state policy on divorce, considers such period to be in derogation of the power of its courts. According to the recent Supreme Court decision, the latter state may so consider it: "Nevada has no interest that we can respect in issuing divorce decrees with extra-territorial effect to those who are domiciled elsewhere and who secure sham domicils in Nevada solely for divorce purposes." The result: a plethora of divorce decrees that are indigenously valid but *without extra-territorial effect* — the foundations of bigamy and bastardy.

In definition of domicil the court also quotes with approval the instruction of the North Carolina judge to the jury that domicil is "that place where a person has voluntarily fixed his abode—not for a mere special or temporary purpose, but with a present intention of making it his home, either permanently or for an indefinite or unlimited length of time." This connotation is based upon a subjective and prior (perhaps temporary) intent existing in the mind of the petitioner—a matter incapable of satisfying legal proof generally; it is vague, unsubstantial, and unverifiable — an issue that is most apt to be decided in fact by the social and moral preferences related to divorce that are held by the court.

Much would be gained in the way of certainty and stability of family status if, as Justice Rutledge suggests, the period of residence required for domicil were made definite (and perhaps longer) everywhere. Yet it would appear that precision of domiciliary period is exactly what the various states have attempted to establish by statute—a definiteness which is not now required to be respected outside its jurisdiction. Also, it is clear that many of the 41 states which require the residence of a year or more (some of them two years or more) will not be inclined to recognize and sanction decrees based upon domicils of considerably less than one year, as required by six states. (South Carolina permits no divorce without special act of the legislature.) If each state considered the same period of time to be sufficient, domicil would already have been defined similarly in the several jurisdictions. As it is, a presumption of sham is apt to attach to residence periods shorter than those required by the law of a given jurisdiction.

It may well be granted that in a great preponderance of migratory divorces (these are believed to constitute about three per cent of all divorces), the domicil in the granting state has been only technical and for the specific purpose of securing the decree. But it is significant culturally and legally that *domicil for divorce purposes* has come into acceptance in the social and legal folkways. Americans have proceeded reasonably on an assumption of the validity of migratory divorces secured in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this country. That such a presupposition should be permitted to exist, sustained by the years of marital and divorce practices in the society, and then be overturned by an unpredictable and close judicial decision, is a matter for profound perturbation. Justice Frankfurter said truly that one may act at his peril in these matters and a plea of good faith or ignorance will not be heard in defense of such acts. Mistaken notions about one's legal rights are not sufficient to bar prosecution for crime. Yet where these rights have been undefined in the law and rather clearly defined in social custom affecting many thousands, a sudden retroactive voiding of the custom by judicial fiat may wreak domestic and social havoc. It subjects to unjustifiable penalty those who have conformed to custom in the absence of a legal or judicial rule and who have depended upon decrees still conceded to be valid where issued. If legal soundness be conceded to the Williams opinion on domicil, it would be nearly just to apply the rule to future conduct rather than to divorces and remarriages previously established. Justice Black very well expressed this view in his dissent when he said, "After a judgment has been declared 'void' it still remains to decide as to the consequences attached to good faith conduct between its rendition and its nullification." In effect the court's decision was *ex post facto* law.

What, then, can be done about this chaotic confusion of marital status? For the individual who has been newly blessed by *Williams v. North Carolina* with two or more wives and threatened with possible denial of legitimate parenthood to a part of his brood, there is no very satisfactory solution. Such a person could with maximum safety reside in the state where his divorce decree was issued. Or, in the alternative, he might make his home in a state where the court recognized as valid such circumstances of domicil as he had established in procuring a divorce. Under these conditions, however, his property in any state denying validity to the domicil and decree might still be subjected to levy for the fulfillment of his obligations to the prior spouse, as defined in that state. If he must himself remain in a state which denies his divorce and remarriage, his only legal protection is through annulment of the subsequent marriage and then, if possible, the dissolution there of the first.

Obviously such techniques as these to assure security in one's domestic establishment are closed or undesirable to the mass of divorced persons. A broader solution of the problem is required. Under today's customs it will prove intolerable to require parties who cannot secure dissolution of their marriage in their home state to move permanently to another jurisdiction in search of freedom. There can be no heightening of respect or stability for the law or for the family under such a rule in this age of mobility,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moral emancipation, and increased demands upon marriage. Any real attempt at enforcement of the rule could result only in a general increase of desertion, institutionalized adultery and bastardy.

The best and simplest solution, the writer believes, would be a reversal of the opinion by the Supreme Court with a finding that when a state court in due process has established a sufficient domicil to exist under its statute, the jurisdictional power established and exercised thereon is mandatory and unimpeachable—not merely persuasive—on the courts of other states. This would, of course, simply extend the full faith and credit provision to include jurisdictional facts as found by our courts. It would imply too that individuals who could satisfy the legal requirements of any state might there seek the relief that they could not secure at home. This has been a customary practice in American divorce customs. The contrary rule, now established, means that the person whose residence is based on occupational, geographic, social or other preferences must either conform to the peculiar standards of divorce and marriage existing there (however conservative they may be relative to the country as a whole) or move permanently to another state. Such an eventual change in Supreme Court opinion is not wholly unlikely, in view of the fact that the Williams Case was a close decision and that constitutional constructions have been changing rapidly in recent years in response to evolving conceptions of public policy and welfare.

Barring such an unpredictable reversal of opinion, the familiar issue may be raised again of a federal constitutional amendment whereby the law of marriage and divorce might be nationalized. It is unnecessary to enter here the well-worn arguments on a federal law of marriage and divorce. It is sufficient perhaps to indicate the great practical difficulty that the states do differ extensively in their dominant philosophies regarding divorce and marriage—differences which probably continue excessive for the consensus required to amend. The disparities in belief and practice are wide enough that it may well be doubted that the same rules should apply universally in our heterogeneous society. However, a sufficiently satisfactory compromise might be effected in a narrower area of agreement: the period of time necessary to establish jurisdiction for divorce. There would be considerable advantage, legal and social, in such limited uniformity throughout the country. Agreement by most of the 42 states which required a year or more for domicil upon one year (possibly, but improbably, six months) as sufficient domiciliary foundation for jurisdiction to divorce should be a feasible improvement. Among other things it would serve to moderate excited and unthoughtful — often temporary—enthusiasms to "depose" one spouse and "mount" another by way of a brief vacation in Reno

103323
PRODUCED BY HATHITRUST.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or Miami. It would also tend to homogenize individuals' marital status.

Finally, a simpler solution than amendment has been recommended by the editor of *Lawyer Service Letter*. He suggests the passage of a federal law to this effect: "Where a court of any state has granted a judgment of divorce based upon domicile in that state for one year or more, no federal court shall decline to give full faith and credit to the judgment on the ground that domicile was other than as found in the judgment." This would attempt to accomplish by the simpler expedient of a statute the purpose of making domicil a more specific concept, universally applied. The constitutionality of such a bill might well come into question as an indirect device to impose a federal rule in an area that is of local concern. However, contemporary constitutional law has witnessed considerable ingenuity in the extension of federal control through analogous devices. Moreover, such a law would not require that state courts sanction the domicil approved elsewhere. And appeal through to the federal courts is an expensive proposition.

One of these methods must come to be employed in the interest of preserving a modicum of stability in the American family system. A high rate of divorce and disintegration of marital patterns our family institutions can—and have—assimilated. Despite the modern defunctionalized and often impermanent character of marriage, the family system has continued to be a culturally-dependable source of population replacement by legitimate offspring. Today, the hurried, ill-advised marriages of wartime and war's deterioration of moral standards threaten an impending decomposition of the family organization to a degree which our society has never before witnessed. During the inevitable dissolution of weakly-constituted families in the post-war period and the re-integration of more firm ones, the preservation of some solidarity in the basic family pattern will be difficult enough. But to change now "the rules of the game" and of a sudden to bastardize the born, to bigamize past bona fide marriages, to welcome suits for technical desertion and to foreclose the incompatible from escape is an invitation to disaster!

* * *

● Senator Ferguson of Michigan has his own pet gripe with the OPA. He claims that the textile shortage has reduced Detroit males to "buying ladies' panties for their own use."

* * *

● They are still talking about the mayor of a French town who was instructed, during the German occupation of France, to order all shopkeepers and cafe owners to serve the Germans before serving civilians. Signs were posted in all windows to this effect. But the Germans complained when the order appeared in the window of the undertaker.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labor and Management Need to Get Together for the Post-War Era

II – From Collective Bargaining to Planning and Control

By Mark Starr
Educational Director, International Ladies Garment Workers

THE role of the unions in reconversion and securing full employment will set the stage for their future status and participation in industry. The first premise of these articles is that the social intelligence of the people of these democratic United States — which out-fought, out-produced and out-invented the Hitler and Hirohito dupes — will solve the problems of peace and utilize the unprecedented productivity so greatly accelerated by the war.

It will, of course, be more difficult to reconvert because there are vested interests in the way of mass production of houses, civilian jeeps, electrical equipment, refrigerators, agricultural equipment, etc. Then too, there is no Pearl Harbor to fuse us into unity by fear. There are no obstacles, however, which cannot be tackled by the unions in conjunction with experienced administrators and technicians. We can begin a new chapter in happier industrial relations and in greater efficiency.

In *Dynamics of Industrial Democracy*, Clinton S. Golden and Harold J. Ruttenberg emphasized in 1942 that "management's assumption of sole responsibility for productive efficiency actually prevents the attainments of maximum output." They speak of a necessary outlet for the creative desires of the worker and they claim that:

> "Union-management cooperation tends to make management more efficient and unions more cost-conscious, thereby improving the competitive position of a business enterprise and increasing the earnings of both workers and owners."

Management and Labor have certainly learned much about each other in the labor-management committees suggested by Donald Nelson in 1942 and numbering at their peak in 1944, 4,400 committees covering 7,000,000 employees. The full story of the increased productivity secured by these committees remains to be told. In the Kaiser shipyards on the West coast, 21,792 suggestions made by workers saved $6,000,000 in power and materials. With cutbacks in the air after V-E Day, the workers complained that the committee plant journals did not inform them and insisted that partners should not be ditched without some warning. When V-J Day came such complaints were multiplied, although President Truman on August 16 quickly laid down a labor policy to cushion the cutbacks by unemployment compensation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

While the wartime committees were in large part responsible for the avalanche of modern lethal weapons which overwhelmed the Nazis, they are not likely to be important in the reconversion problems. Something more than suggestions to lessen turnover, to reduce absenteeism, to save time and material and something more than the quick efficient settlement of inplant grievances are now needed. The fundamental purpose of industry and its control are at stake. No longer does the peril of defeat in war put the class struggle between the sellers and buyers of labor power into cold storage. Democratic principles have to be translated into everyday peacetime living and practice. The grouping of citizens on the basis of *where they live* has to be supplemented by a functional democracy based on *what they do*. In industry as in politics we face the transformation from a boss hierarchy of giving and taking orders to a round table at which different but equally important groups will discuss and decide upon important plans for industrial well-being. This will rescue democracy from drowning in the oratorical flood of platitudes heard on the Fourth of July and at election rallies. We shall not only count noses of people but draw upon their special skills to decide matters about which they have had practical experience.

Here we leave the heat of the hustings and refine our ideas of democracy. G. B. Shaw said government *of* and *for* the people, yes, but *by* the people, no. That would be like letting the passengers drive the express train. But is Shaw right in this view? Cannot the people know how to delegate authority to experts and yet retain general control? Can not the workers in each industry be given a feeling of responsibility and belonging which is necessary to human happiness?

Some surprising advances in industrial democracy are likely. After 12 years of investigation at the Hawthorne plant of the Western Electric, Professor F. J. Roethlisberger and his colleagues found authoritarian methods in industry created inefficiency and that satisfactory human relationships in the factory were more important than improved lighting. Their *Management and Worker* reported:

> "What impressed management most, however, were the stores of latent energy and productive cooperation which clearly could be obtained from a working force under the right conditions. And among the factors making these conditions the attitudes of the employees stood out as being of predominant importance."

In *Practical Applications of Democracy*, George B. de Huszar makes some valuable suggestions how human relationships in industry can be improved and the evils of bureaucracy removed. Both personnel experts, business and trade union leaders would benefit from his chapter on industry.

Obviously, increasing workers' control and participation in industry will best come slowly and gradually and through general ne-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gotiations between employers and employees. Supreme Court Justice Brandeis, who in his early days back in 1910 persuaded the garment employers to accept collective bargaining, believed that workers should obtain better work conditions only as a step to increasing responsibility in the conduct of business until they "as free and self-respecting citizenry" attained its control. Manya Gordon in *How to Tell Progress from Reaction* has examined the idea in a suggestive helpful way, showing how government employees so far have suffered both from small pay and petty tyranny.

The wiser and farseeing heads of business such as Eric Johnston, head of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, and Henry J. Kaiser have recognized the need for continuing the labor-management cooperation developed to win the war. A charter embodying such principles was signed by Mr. Johnston and William Green (AFL) and Phillip Murray (CIO) n the early months of 1945. However, the National Association of Manufacturers, influenced by the nti-union Automotive Council, reused to sign because it interpreted he charter as freezing the legal tatus and rights of the unions vhich it wished to amend in some articulars. Further, some NAM nembers suspected that such a tep would be the camel putting its oot into the tent with ulterior purposes of interfering with managerial control.

William Hutcheson, head of the Carpenters Union, also raised some objections to the powers of the president of the AFL to commit the Federation. Only in a few states such an Indiana and Massachusetts were attempts made to apply the charter on a state level and little is currently heard of the National Labor and Business Committee which was to be set up under its provisions.

More important was the labor-industry-government conference suggested to the newly appointed Secretary of Labor, Lewis B. Schwellenbach, by Senator Vandenberg, with Phillip Murray proposing that Secretary of Commerce Henry A. Wallace be a joint convenor. Then V-J Day brought President Truman into the picture with a labor-management conference to meet the urgent reconversion problems. Both the proposed charter and the joint government conference are likely to be menaced by the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill against which all sections of labor are now militantly arrayed.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

To turn from the general picture to examine the present status of local, state and federal government employees is disturbing to advocates of workers' control. Even the right of state employees to organize is contested. The late William Allen White compared them to soldiers with "no right to strike, no right to go clamoring for more pay while on duty." Unions, according to White, could not do "one blessed thing for the state employees but get them into trouble . . . " He continued:

"A union raises a 'conflicting

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

double loyalty, loyalty to the union and loyalty to the state. There can be no double loyalty in the government of Kansas. Men employed on roads, men employed in protecting the health services of this state, men employed in the educational institutions, all are soldiers, protecting the state. It is unthinkable and un-American for them to join a union."

Apparently the Sage of Emporia's assertions were accepted by state employees because in 1939 only 15 per cent of the total five million public employees were organized in a bewildering variety of unions. In the eyes of Mr. White and other opponents, the "merit system" and tenure were supposed to make unions unnecessary but only 20 states have "service-wide merit systems" and in only 47 per cent of all cities with over 10,000 population do workers have civil service status. Thus public employment is largely anti-union and sub-standard. The National Institute of Municipal Law Officers actually has gone so far as to suggest that municipalities can not legally make contracts with unions. Despite this, however, contracts are being made and the growth of the unions' influence in politics will strengthen the trend. Mayor LaGuardia repeated in 1942 and 1944 that no civil service employee had the right to strike and proposed to fire any of the New York 36,000 subway employees who quit. Wise administrators know that strikes are not prevented by ukase but by appropriate settlement and arbitration procedures. The street cleaners can, for example, strike by the subterfuge of being sick simultaneously. The example in administrative democracy set up by the TVA (see earlier article in this series) has not yet seriously influenced municipalities to experiment with workers' control even at lowest levels.

WARTIME EFFECTS

But the drive to organize government employees has been speeded up by wartime reductions in real wages. In New Haven and Hartford, Conn., there are now specific laws authorizing collective bargaining. The State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL) has 10,000 civil service workers in 15 cities asking for a uniform recognition law in New York State. Its leader, Ellis Ranen, has aided the N. Y. Liberal Party to develop a model program for the November city election. From Atlanta, Ga., to Chicago, Ill., policemen are being organized. The New York City Fire Department recognizes the union despite the fact that in neighboring Philadelphia the Fire Fighters Union is ignored. Incidentally, the bogey of a lightning strike in essential services, endangering life, has no real basis because in all such services and even in the schools the unions are prepared to apply voluntarily a no-strike rule.

For industry generally the advance from collective bargaining to collective planning and joint operation by the unions will involve changes both in outlook and methods. Union leaders and members will have, in some instances

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to educate themselves about the differences in private and public enterprise. Studies should be made of publicly owned and operated companies and utilities in this and other countries in which outstanding technicians and administrators have been given responsibility and power and freed from harassment by petty politicians. Further, some conception of industry as an integral whole will be indispensable, which means a much wider orbit of interest than in the single plant union-management committee. The proposed joint councils for reconversion cannot operate successfully on the basis of a single industry. And to participate in such councils the trade unions will need a deeper knowledge of the techniques of production and of the general economic layout. So far only one union in the United States (the United Auto Workers) has declared for public ownership and that conditional upon the failure of private owned corporations to provide employment. The majority of union leaders fear bureaucrats and regimentation as much as business. They echo the slogans about "free enterprise." Even the younger leaders do not propose radical social changes. They propose a political coalition of labor, farmers, technicians, professional workers to retain the advances made under the New Deal. Victor G. Reuther favors government ownership of public utilities and banks but wants no "smothering of individual initiative" nor a "bureaucratic statism." His postwar pattern would:

> "First of all, embrace and implement the theory of government guarantees of social security for all. Second, it would compel the elimination of monopoly controls, both in banking and investments, and in the marketplace. Third, it would encourage the development of democracy in industry with a maximum of state intervention by stimulating labor participation in management through free contractual relationships between unions and employers. Fourth, it would cultivate the growth of consumer and producer cooperatives which, in competition with non-monopolistic free enterprise, would make efficiency and public service rather than profit the compelling motive in economic affairs. Finally, it would emphasize full production and full employment to be attained by private initiative where practicable and bolstered by government enterprise where necessary."

The general public knows and cares little about Labor's share in control of industry if the recent *Fortune* survey result is dependable. When asked whether labor unions "should be given more say about the way companies are run," only 17.6 per cent of the replies thought it a good idea with 64.9 thinking it was not so good. How the unions can better inform public opinion, how they can educate themselves and develop the self restraint necessary to democratic living and an examination of the nature of the freedom of unions in Soviet Russia in government owned and operated industry will be treated in the final article of this series.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Los Angeles Struggle for An Open Market

Can Our Cities Buy at the "Lowest and Best" Price?

By Reuben W. Borough
Journalist and former member of Los Angeles Board of Public Works

THE struggle for open markets, in which the "lowest and best" price prevails, is, and should be, the perpetual concern of American business. Upon the success of that struggle, at home and abroad, depend the health and perpetuity of private enterprise. It is chiefly on markets, greatly expanded beyond pre-war proportions, that millions of Americans are now relying for full employment in the post-war period. No potential field for open markets, therefore, should be over-looked.

An enticing field lies directly under our collective nose: the realm of public buying to meet the needs of federal, state, municipal and other political bodies. It has always been important; it is even more important with the ending of the war when there must be heavy purchases to replace worn-out and obsolete operative equipment and to meet the generally increased demand for materials and supplies.

All of the arguments that apply to open markets in the field of private buying apply in the field of public buying. It can easily be demonstrated that consumption of public bodies in an open market is considerably higher than consumption in a closed market, dominated by special interests. As with the housewife, whose wants are normally in excess of an inflexible budget, price here determines the volume of buying.

The administration of Mayor Fletcher Bowron came to power in Los Angeles in 1938 pledged to the extension of the open market—unhampered competitive bidding—in the purchase of public materials and supplies. It went seriously to work at the job. It achieved some notable successes. It met with some failures. To attain the administration's objectives, its most vital elements, including the mayor, carried on an unremitting struggle. They had to—for, in public as in private buying, obstacles are continuously thrown in the way of the open market: competition comes hard.

A survey of the Bowron administration's significant experiences in this matter is enlightening. Because municipal purchases for the tax-supported departments largely center in the board of public works in Los Angeles, attention is directed to that agency.

It will be clarifying to note in advance that the board in the five and more years under examination applied three distinct theories, instead of one as might have been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expected, to the award of contracts for the purchase of city materials and supplies:

Theory I. The city should buy only from the "lowest and best" bidder, as required by the city charter.

Theory II. The city may, when convenience (record of good service) indicates, buy and continue to buy from one of a number of identical bidders.

Theory III. The city may seek to cure past "unfair" (unequal) awards among identical bidders by giving the business to those who, for a period of years, have been denied contracts.

FALSE START

Notwithstanding the administration's campaign commitments, the first large contract (gasoline) let by the board (February, 1939) went to one of two identical bidders. The motion, adopted in violation of the city charter, stated that the award was made to "one of the lowest and best bidders." The contract covered the requirements of the city, aside from its proprietary harbor and water and power departments, for a year. The estimated quantities to be bought were above 1,700,000 gallons. The price quoted by the identical "competitors" was nearly $200,000.

The two appointees of Mayor Bowron and the holdover member from the preceding administration had apparently been bowled over by the bizarre reasoning of the city purchasing agent:

"This company has been outstanding for several years in quoting prices to us, independent of all other oil companies and particularly the group who are trying to control prices. This firm is also familiar with our delivery problems and therefore an award to them would eliminate the confusion incident to making a change of vendors." (Theory II)

The perfect basis for a frozen status quo and the death of free enterprise!

In July, 1939, Mayor Bowron appointed two additional members to the board, both of whom had been active in the recall movement that elected him (the first two appointees had not been) and had publicly condemned the prior board's loose methods in awarding materials contracts. One of their first decisions was to end identical bidding. The remedy proposed was an obvious one: to reject identical bids on any item and to call for new bids; and to continue rejections until a break in price was forced. Thus, it was believed, the commercial world would be convinced that the city meant to buy in the lowest market, identical bids would be discouraged if not entirely prevented, and, at any rate, fresh competition inspired to cut under the "combine."

Nearly six months after the two crusaders took office the city's gasoline contract for 1940 was up for action. The bids came in as usual—identical from the "combine" (six members this time) with higher bids from several other companies.

The estimated requirements were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the same as for the previous year. The identical price was around $25,000 less than the previous year's identical price. It is a matter of speculation whether this reduction was the result of the board's newly adopted firmness or a changed market. Whichever it was, the new members were not impressed. They recommended that the bids be rejected and proposals again called for. They were elated to have the support of the three other board members, which made the vote unanimous.

However, their sense of triumph was sobered by the realization that their program now faced performance. Would the "combine," as they had been warned, be able to hold out and compel price conformity? Suppose it succeeded? Should the board surrender? Should it make an arbitrary award in violation of the city charter?

The two crusaders concluded that the board should get rid of its inferiority complex, should remember that it represented a great city and should act on the assumption that a contract with that city was as valuable to any of the companies as to the city. They were convinced that with persistence the board could win.

Confirmation came immediately. The new bids presented the same old identical price structure—from the "combine." But for one of the "independents" the prospect of selling 1,700,000 gallons of gasoline to a customer of unassailable credit was too much to withstand. It submitted a bid nearly $5,000 below the identical bids of the "combine." And every member of the board voted for an award to the low bidder.

This decision for the tax payers—and for free enterprise—set a binding precedent as far as gasoline was concerned. The following year—1941—two of the "major" companies broke from the "combine's" prices, one of them by a wide margin and the other less strikingly. The lowest bidder's price was $13,000 less than the second lowest bidder's and $14,035 less than the "combine's."

Again the recommendation for the award was unanimously voted. It was all very re-assuring.

FURTHER VICTORY AGAINST COMBINE

In 1942 the fighting spirit of the city purchasing agent and the board flared so high that at the start they not only demanded a "low bid" on their gasoline contract, and got it, but they rejected this "low bid" and the competing offers as "unreasonably high." The second set of bids, promptly called for, proved them to have been right.

But the dollar reward was not the only welcome result of the city's uncompromising alertness. The "combine's" morale had apparently been shaken to its roots. Only two of its former members held to the identical bids the second time up. Six companies struck under these two with varying prices. The lowest was $7,570 under the two identical bidders.

The city was winning; along with it, private enterprise.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

First bids on the city's 1945 requirements were rejected. With the companies under the stress of meeting the nation's wartime demands, the commitments as to deliveries had been so conditional as to render the bids illegal.

The second bids were regular as to delivery commitments but were not competitive in all three categories of the gasoline bought. Two insistent members of the "combine" were identical on one of them, "high octane" gasoline, the main item of purchase. On this item the low bidders—two "independents"—were also identical. But the "independents" had varying bids on the remainder of the contract. The board, properly, awarded the entire contract to the lowest over-all bidder, effecting a saving to the city of more than $3,750 for a six-month period.

A summary shows that in the purchase of gasoline the board's strict adherence to Theory I (after the bad start) saved the tax payers more than $87,000 in a five-year period. But it did more than that. It cracked the "combine's" solidarity, which had been a bad economic and political influence in the city.

Now as to another item bought through competitive bids: liquid asphalt, or road oil, used in laying the city's rock and oil pavements. Again the board's attitude was in contrast to that of the preceding board, which had awarded the liquid asphalt contract for 1939 to one of six identical bidders.

While the savings through the revival of competition here were small for 1940 and 1941—totaling more than $1,000—the defection from the "combine" of several members both years seemed to promise much for the future.

The very next year, 1942, however, an unexpected setback occurred: the "combine's" recalcitrants were whipped back into line and all the members joined in identical bids.

The board fought back, called for new bids.

The result was a windfall for the city. A new enterpriser entered the field with quotations far below the "combine's." Promptly the efficiency and "up-to-dateness" of his plant, as well as his financial responsibility, were questioned. But he passed muster notwithstanding mutterings of doubt from department administrators who undoubtedly were honestly wedded to past connections on a good service basis.

He got the contract by unanimous board action. On 10,200 tons of liquid asphalt he saved the tax payers more than $8,000.

Next year the board slipped a little—the only time in its purchases of liquid asphalt. Correctly, it gave all the 1943 tank truck and trailer deliveries to the newcomer, who again sharply underbid the "combine." But it handed the rail deliveries to a "combine" member despite the identical bids submitted—the newcomer had stayed out of this field. The city's savings, therefore, were considerably less than those of 1942. On an estimated 50-50 split of 600 tons a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

month between the "combine" member and the low bidder, they were little more than $2,000.

The following year the competitor-recruit was in brave mood and the city prospered accordingly. He went out for all the 1944 liquid asphalt business, both types of delivery, slicing far under the "combine's" identical bids. The city benefited by more than $8,800.

These savings on liquid asphalt purchases totaled $20,000 for the five-year period—nearly $29,000 if the sixth year is included. This achievement in economy may not have been so important as the attendant mobilization of a brisk new "go-getter" into the competitive field—a development which signalized the opening of a new door of opportunity for ambitious enterprisers and thus sharpened the interest of the business community in the local municipal market.

WAVERING INCONSISTENCIES

Now we come to a different kind of a record, an irritating record of wavering inconsistencies. In its purchases of asphaltic cement, used in the resurfacing of city pavements, the board demanded competitive bidding for the 1940, 1941, and 1942 awards and cut the city's payments under the "combine's" prices by a total of $9,300. A minor share of the 1943 business was awarded on a low bid to the spectacular enterpriser whom we have watched crack the liquid asphalt "combine." But the major share went to the successful competitive bidder of the three prior years—this time at the "combine's" identical figures.

It was worse in 1944 and 1945. The same successful bidder was handed all the business despite his non-competitive bids. And in the process the board turned down a bid from the troublesome "outside" enterpriser for the year 1944 that was $4,500 under the "combine's" quotation. Reason given: the failure in quality of one delivery lot of his material the preceding year.

In 1945 the "outsider" joined the asphaltic cement "combine"!

It is probable that the high asphaltic cement prices charged the city due to the board's failure to hold the competitive line throughout this period cost the people more than its faithful performance during the first three years saved.

Why did the board make the awards to this particular identical bidder? Officially, it alleged that the low bidder—the troublesome competitor-enterpriser — had an untrustworthy product (his record of one failure weighed heavily against him with the street maintenance bureau head) and it concluded therefore that he should be eliminated notwithstanding his attractive offer. So far its judgment may have been sound, although the complete record of the low bidder's performance (one failure in 90 tests) does not so indicate. But even if the rejection were correct, the award to a higher identical bidder would be an improper next step. The logical action under the city charter would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been to reject all bids and call for new ones.

Unofficially, and off the record, board members indicated other reasons. Competition was impracticable in the war years. The government's "ceiling" prices stood in the way. The counter argument that a "ceiling" was not a "floor" and that the "ceiling" had not prevented competition in the purchase of gasoline and road oil was brushed lightly aside. The board was plainly in a mood for change —at least as to asphaltic cement— and the bureau head concerned furnished the basis for the change in his advocacy of an award to the identical bidder on the ground that he had given good service (Theory II) and that the quality of his product had been unassailable!

In the board's purchase of cement the same trend or pattern is observable as in its purchase of asphaltic cement. The board starts its five- or six-year performance by breaking sharply with its predecessor's record of awards to non-competitive bidders. For several years it insists on a low bidder and gets one. It becomes fond of this low bidder (one particular company) and then for the final two or three years of the period it hands the business to this bidder (now a member of the "combine") despite his non-competitive bid. Reason: "Quality of products and service" is "satisfactory" and here is "therefore no reason for change" (Theory II).

In the purchase of blue print paper and similar engineering work-plan materials the board swung between courageous defense of competitive bidding and a new appeasement policy of "equitable" treatment to all bidders (Theory III). The city engineer, with a board majority approval, plugged for a division of the award between two identical bidders:

" . . . consideration was given to the amount of business received by each of the bidders over a period of five years and as a matter of equity it was determined that the contract should be divided between the two bidders receiving the least amount of the business during that period."

The city engineer had displaced the charter!

For a time the board, goaded by its two crusader members, revolted against this sort of thing. But not for long—the compromise way was so much pleasanter.

One important comment on the board's contract-letting in another field should here be made. It held rigidly to competitive requirements in awarding assessment district sewer and paving jobs, by dollar measure its most important single function. (Credit, in part, to the contractors.) And it was rewarded by a healthy volume of exciting bidding.

Summing up: the board's record was an advance over that of its predecessor. Sooner or later the citizens must insist that dollar honesty in public servants is not enough, that to be effectively loyal in performance such honesty must be buttressed by alertness.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We Need to Reform the German Undemocratic Educational System

The Re-education of Germany: An American Experiment

By Frederick H. Cramer
Professor of History, Mount Holyoke College

MEN only, not countries, can be educated. More recently, the trend has been away from the sweeping wartime views of the Vansittart school of thought which declared all Germans to be incorrigible. Even learned writers who pretend to find convincing evidence of teutonic nastiness as far back as the days of Arminius, the Holy Roman Empire, or Martin Luther, often wind up their pseudo-historical treatise with a somewhat illogical hope that those very Germans whose egocentric, sadistic and warlike tendencies they themselves have so eloquently described will somehow miraculously succumb to the effects of our benign re-education.

The opinion on how long we shall have to exercise our beneficient influence by occupying our zone varies from some months to a generation. The real difficulty besetting an American experiment of this sort lies in the fact that even in our own zone our basic policy is subject to a four-partite agreement to be reached within the Allied control commission, where the United States represents but one of the four occupying powers, the other three being France, England and Russia. Within certain limits, however, we are still free to develop our own policy in the details of the management of German affairs within our own zone.*

The deeply-rooted American admiration of efficiency per se has already proved a stumbling block in any road directed towards re-education of the German people. It has become necessary to remind American administrators that their primary task is the weeding out of Nazism, even if their cherished dream of efficient administration should be marred by the dismissal of a number of otherwise efficient Nazi officials. On the other hand, the section of Germany selected as the American zone of occupation is wholly unrepresentative of modern Germany, whose main strength and real menace were its formidable industries. We do, indeed, control some important factory centers like Hoechst, Frankfurt on the Main, Mannheim-Ludwigshafen - Oppau, Stuttgart and Augsburg, but nowhere have we to cope with the problems of such vast industrial areas as the British in the Ruhr region, or the Russians in the Saxonian industrial center. On the whole, the

*I am omitting our local belated and ineffectual attempts of POW re-education, embellished by such antics as lie-detector tests, etc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American zone is relatively thinly populated by a largely agrarian group of Germans.

The real problems of German industrial re-organization are, in our zone, conspicuous by their very absence. The mainsprings of German economic and intellectual life have been transferred from the south to the north of Germany during the past century, and although such charming and often high-ranking universities as Heidelberg, Tuebingen, Frankfurt, Erlangen and Munich lie in our zone, it is doubtful whether in general vigor and achievement they were the equals of such northern universities as, for instance, Goettingen, or Berlin. Finally, even in the religious realm, the American zone does not give a true picture of Germany, inasmuch as Catholicism is by far the dominant creed in our zone, while for Germany as a whole it was a minority group.

NOT SELFLESS HUMANITARIANISM

Our effort in re-educating the German people in our main zone, as well as in our sector of Berlin, is not based on selfless humanitarianism. We are in Germany to forestall the recurrence of another volcanic outbreak from within what was the world's second ranking industrial power. This is in our own interest, as well as that of Germany's more immediate neighbors. The re-education of the German people is therefore geared to a goal which—we flatter ourselves—will not only rid us of any future German menace, but which may even turn the Germans themselves into more pacific and neighborly human beings. In this sense, everything we undertake is part and parcel of our re-education program, whether we like to look at it that way or not. Re-education is a total process. Thus we are trying to break up the *I. G. Farbenindustrie*, whose American offshoot *Agfa* is perhaps best known to millions of amateur photographers,—we arrest leading industrialists, we are — maybe — bringing a bunch of German war criminals to trial at Nuremberg, we "requisition" a valuable historical collection of specie in Berlin despite the new *Oberbuergermeister's* protests. We have abandoned the ban against fraternization, although no *Fraeulein* can legally marry a GI Joe as yet, and the drastic rise in venereal infections among our men in Germany indicates that fraternization can be a serious and unsavory business as well. After making dire threats through most of the summer about not feeding the Germans during the coming winter, we have sensibly revised our policy and are going to import enough food to maintain a 2,000 daily calories diet through the winter season.

So far, the attitude of the staid educated middle-class people of southern Germany shows little effect. They still believe that they are living through one of history's frequent eclipses of German power to be followed somehow sometime by another period of German as-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cendancy. The younger people are naturally still strongly infected with the Nazi-virus, but, as the execution of some courageous Communist students at Munich revealed as early as 1943, there must be at least a minority among the German youth opposed to those very teachings which Hitler and his henchmen drilled into them year in and year out. It is furthermore generally agreed that there is now a substantial Communist group inside our own zone of occupation. To what extent these men and women are merely disgruntled and disappointed Nazis who hope to exchange a red dictatorship for a brown one is difficult to say. At least a core of this group may well consist of pre-1933 leftist voters.

NO EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Nowhere, however, have our responsible officials been caught napping more soundly than in the realm of education proper. We had almost four years since December, 1941, in which to prepare a constructive program for German re-education through German schools. Despite the paper shortage, committees of well-meaning professors and other interested men and women have created a mountain of reports, statistics, data and documents on the topic, but the one decisive thing — action based on sound policy — has been studiously avoided. To cite but one instance of many: L. B. Fischer, son-in-law and heir of Germany's greatest pre-Hitler publisher, S. Fischer, a Jew, began the preparation of a complete new series of readers, history textbooks, etc., in the middle of 1944. Himself a reliable refugee, Mr. Fischer commissioned a staff of experts to write these books, geared specifically to the exigencies of a democratic re-education program. Meanwhile, by September, 1945, neither the War Department nor any other agency has seen fit to utilize this important material on any large scale. What have we done instead?

First we have closed every single educational institution. So far so good. This was rightly considered as one of the minor consequences of Germany's catastrophic defeat. Somehow, used to our long summer vacation—wholly unknown in Germany—we also did not see anything wrong with closing the schools in April or May, instead of in June, when American schools usually close for the summer. Nevertheless, this is but one symptom of our general misconception concerning the German school system as such, and since this ignorance underlies much of our educational policy in occupied Germany, it may be of some use to describe in a nutshell the existing German school system which—with amazingly few modifications—is still the one that prevailed in the age of Bismarck and William II.

At the very top of the educational pyramid we find the German university, invariably state owned and managed. It became by 1914 co-educational and knew nothing of the dormitory system After three or more years of at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tendance a student could take his doctorate in his field of concentration. The usual age for entering these universities was 18 or 19 years. In most cases the sesame which opened the gates to one of these establishments was the diploma certifying successful completion of one of the various kinds of "higher schools." Three main types had come into being by 1914: the traditional *Gymnasium* where the main emphasis was still put upon Latin and Greek, although French, English, mathematics and the sciences were also taught, the *Realgymnasium*, where Latin, modern languages and the sciences formed the main part of the curriculum, and finally the *Oberrealschule*, where only modern languages, mathematics and sciences were stressed. These institutions were either co-educational as early as 1914, or separate schools of this type were set up for girls, as well as boys. For parents desirous of giving their daughters a less academic but still higher education, the *Hoehere Toechterschule* offered some modern languages, mathematics and sciences in a ten-year curriculum.

Two main points about this entire system of German higher education may be stressed: practically all institutions were public, and charged an amazingly modest tuition fee. On the other hand, the three first-mentioned kinds of "higher schools" presented an integrated curriculum of 12 years, receiving their students usually at the age of 6 and releasing them with their diplomas 12 years later at an average age of 18. In contrast to American schools, scholarships were given infrequently to children from poorer families, and the holders of such scholarships were severely snubbed by their better heeled classmates. In one important way, the pre-1914 network of German "higher schools," all state-controlled and not by the national government at Berlin, was geared to the German military machine. Under the then prevailing system of conscription, the student of one of the three kinds of higher schools enjoyed remarkable privileges. If he had attended at least nine of the prescribed 12 years in one of these institutions, he need serve only one year in the armed forces. Moreover, he became the sole candidate for an officer's commission.

Although these privileges disappeared in 1918, when conscription and a large army vanished from the German scene, they are indicative of the worst fault inherent in the academically excellent system of German higher education: its uttter lack of democratic features. From the snubbing of the few scholarship holders to the privileged position in the vaunted imperial army, every student at one of those establishments of higher learning could not but be imbued with a feeling of superiority. The remarkable thing about all this is that this sentiment was fostered by a public school system, separated from the elementary institutions for mass instruction only by a ridiculously

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

low tuition fee and no other limitations.

Completely apart from the rarified atmosphere of the higher schools and universities, the mass of the Germans until the present attended only elementary schools for a period of 8 or 9 years. There the *misera plebs* was instructed in the three R's and a smattering of local history, literature and geography.

WEIMAR ATTEMPTS AT EQUALITY

The Weimar republic did very little to bridge the chasm between Germany's relatively poorly educated masses and the highly trained upper-class elite. It made, however, some feeble efforts in that direction. Thus, the first three or four years were to be spent jointly in the same classrooms by all students. This reduced the higher schools to nine instead of twelve years of exclusiveness. Also, scholarships were given in larger numbers to deserving students, and some additional training in certain fields was made mandatory even for those elementary school graduates who had gone into jobs. Nevertheless, the barrier between "educated" and "uneducated" Germans remained almost as rigid as before. How bitterly this gap was resented in some instances, by the young themselves, can be seen from the example of the late Hitler. Flunking the regular (Austrian) "higher-school" was one of the major factors molding his inferiority complex at an early age. Not everyone, of course, reacted quite so drastically, but the fact remains that when Hitler came to power, the German school system was still largely as undemocratic as it had been at the time of Bismarck and William II.

Contrary to popular American notions, Hitler interfered remarkably little with the average curriculum. Classical languages indeed, were tabooed, science encouraged, but the main change took place outside the class-room through the forcible integration of all young boys and girls into the Hitler youth organization whose exercise, training and general activities were set up as even more important than those inside the class-rooms. Also, the great majority of German teachers continued to hold their posts under the Nazi regime. German teachers, on the whole, had once been liberal, even revolutionary, long, long ago in the middle of the 19th century. More lately, however, they had become increasingly tame, and with strong conservative leanings, often "non-political." They conformed to the tolerant Weimar Republic; they also conformed to the Nazi regime—at least the great majority—and they will now conform to our own rules and regulations, paying at least some lip-service to them, while we are present to enforce our wishes.

What was needed before Hitler, and is needed all the more right now, is a thorough-going change of the German school system. No democracy can be inculcated in a Germany in whose schools con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tinues the traditional barrier between the well-to-do and the poor. Again, there is no particle of evidence to the effect that the American policy-makers have moved in that direction at all. Anxiously, we have so far been satisfied to let well enough alone. If we continue along that line, we may as well dismiss all pious hopes for any democracy of the youth of Germany by means of education. Everything, so far, is done by means of improvisation. For instance, Lieutenant Chester C. Axvall of the USFET internal affairs branch, religious education section (!), has been charged with getting textbooks ready for the opening of elementary schools in the American zone. General Eisenhower issued the order. Sometime this summer 5,000,000 books had to be prepared. All plates were made in England, and often flown to Germany, where by September 1 at least the textbooks for the first four grades were ready. The other four grades are supposed to be supplied with their books by October 1st. The printing itself has been done in German plants, and the books consist of readers and history, as well as science texts. There has been, and perhaps rightly, some gloating about the technical feat of providing so many books in such a short time and in the face of severe technical difficulties.

Above all this gigantic — and naturally unnecessarily costly — undertaking has been dedicated to the reprinting of German texts of pre-Nazi days, another eloquent tribute to the complete failure of our educational planning. For, if the pre-1933 German school books were so desirable sources of democratic enlightenment, how come that men like Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, and millions of fanatical Nazis drew their basic knowledge just from the very books of this type? Even were one to argue that most of these older Nazis drank from pre-World War I fountains of scholastic knowledge, certainly those millions of young storm-troopers, S. S. men and fanatical young child-bearers of post-1933 Germany had enjoyed the "benefit" of those very school books we are now reprinting with such touching zeal. What is needed for the re-education of Germany certainly goes far beyond the mere class room. It comprises all phases of life. The motion picture and radio industries and other key industries of Germany are, indeed, taken in hand. Financial, food, fuel and housing problems are being tackled courageously. Where, however, one may be permitted to ask, is a similar demonstration of courage in the highly important field of Germany's undemocratic educational system? True, no new school system, no new textbooks alone will do the trick of converting the German people into pacific, unresentful and good-neighborly human beings, but without a concerted effort in this vital field, we may as well dismiss the loud shouting about the re-education of the German people as so much hog-wash.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is Full Employment Possible?

By Morley G. Dilke

BEFORE the start of World War II the United States had the highest standard of living and the greatest per capita wealth of any nation. At the end of the war this was still true and, in addition, the United States was the strongest military nation in the world. On V-E Day, before the atomic bomb had been released, the United States seemed to most of its people to be the strongest nation on earth. On V-J Day, after the effects of the atomic bomb had been observed, its immediate military supremacy was unquestionable.

Basically, the wealth of the United States rests on the fact that, when America was discovered, land and other natural resources were the principle sources of wealth. Land in Europe was limited and closely held. Landed interests had succeeded in taking each year so great a share of the national production that peasants were living in abject poverty in western Europe. In the United States, on the other hand, indentured servants, after they had worked off their time, could take up land for themselves and keep practically all the proceeds of their work.

As a colonial people, the Americans were restricted to trade with Britain. This resulted first in smuggling and piracy as the basis for the wealth of Massachusetts, and second, in the Revolution. Industries that had been restricted by British policies sprang up during the Revolution. The Federalists believed in a strong central government and aristocracy. They thought that the best way to strengthen the central government was to secure the backing of these infant industries, by tying their financial interests firmly to the interests of the government. This was accomplished basically by the establishment of the tariff and the National Bank.

Although the basic reason for the tariff was to strengthen the central government by attracting the support of manufacturing interests, it was supported on the ground that our industries could not compete with the better established European producers. The tariff permitted manufacturers to sell at higher prices than their European competitors and so assured a larger share of the country's income to them than they would otherwise have obtained.

This was at the expense of all farmers. Tariff schedules were never completely equitable between industries; some industries and all who worked in them prof-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ited at the expense of others. Some industries undoubtedly needed tariff protection to get started, but once started they could have gotten along without it. This began to give the machinery owners in America some of the advantages that land owners had in Europe. There had been large landed estates, particularly in New York and in the South. As more and more desirable land was taken up the power of the great land owners might have clashed seriously with the power of the manufacturers. The Rent Rebellion in New York State ultimately, by breaking the power of the patroons, helped make land ownership less desirable.

A combination of circumstances, perhaps the most important of which was the climate, made slavery advantageous in the South and helped maintain the power of the planters until the Civil War.

LAND VS. MACHINERY

Land as a source of wealth was inherently different from machinery. Although its value could be depleted by soil erosion, land was not subject either to obsolescence or to depreciation to anything like the extent that machinery was and is.

Farmers had always been in active competition with each other for markets. Their products were similar and perishable. Their prices were pretty well controlled by the factors which controlled a free market according to the Manchester School.

Manufacturers early saw that their products could be sold at prices set by them and that their prices had to include labor, the costs of the materials they processed and other costs which gradually came to include all the real costs of capital and a number of intangible costs.

It was obvious to a manufacturer that he had to have a plant, machinery, materials, management and labor. It was also obvious that, if he intended to stay in business, the goods he sold would have to return to him the costs of all these, plus a profit to himself or to anyone else who supplied the capital. After taxes became a serious part of his manufacturing costs they too had to be included in prices. As the country grew and his markets widened, the cost of transportation of materials to his plant and of the finished product to the market also had to be included.

Perhaps the first steps in the direction of what we now know as insurance was the desire of the manufacturer to get back his capital out of profits and to retain his plant and machinery, even if somewhat depreciated. This would give him additional assurance of a means of making his living and also would tend to provide for his old age. In turn, this policy led to fire insurance as an obvious way of spreading the risk of a possible loss of the plant. The desire for large profits and for assurance against risk could be most easily attained by increasing prices. The easiest way to get high prices is to restrict imports through tariffs

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and to restrict competition at home by any means. One of the most obvious ways to restrict competition is by patents, and patents, no matter how justified, have been used for general strengthening of the monopoly positions. The fact that the country was committed to tariff protection of infant industries made it relatively easy to extend the justification of protectionism until Americans thought of the tariff as a means of protecting the American standard of living.

RESTRICTED PRODUCTION

Practically all other imaginable means of restricting competition have been tried at one time or another and this is still a basic policy of American industry. As an operational method American industry paid its men by the hour and, when it did not have work, it laid the men off. Soon some industries realized that they could make greater profits by increasing their prices and restricting their own production to satisfy only the demand of that part of the market that could afford to pay the higher prices.

This was fairly general by the time of the invention of the automobile. It had resulted in a constantly rising scale of prices in manufactured products, and, in effect, had greatly strengthened the financial position of the owners of machinery. In fact, they seemed to be getting themselves into an even better position than the owners of land had been in Europe.

The farm owners early recognized that machine owners had a great advantage over them because tariff protection was given to the machine product. This meant that farmers had to buy at inflated prices at home and sell in competition with the lowest bidder in world markets. They therefore were as a group opposed to tariffs.

The men who worked in industry feared unemployment and low wages and wanted to protect themselves against both.

Pressure for higher wages, which was the first and still is the primary union concern, could be most easily met by the industries which, because of their monopolistic position, could raise prices. The oldest and most powerful trade unions therefore eventually came to have a vested interest in high wages in industries which sold their products at high prices.

In effect, and sometimes consciously, high wages were used to better the position of employers as well as employees.

All pressures forced higher prices of manufacturing goods. Machinery succeeded in getting a larger and larger percentage of the gross income of industry. Prices, wages and tariffs all increased.

Perhaps Henry Ford was the first manufacturer who thought of his men as potential consumers of his products as well as producers. He made the first dramatic effort to raise the wages of his employees while reducing the prices of his car. To make this policy practicable depended upon fuller employment of men and machines.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

However, the policy did not materially affect American wages or prices. When the first World War was fought, American industry supplied the Allies. The Allies could not pay for American goods at American prices so Americans bought bonds, for which the Allies were likewise unable to pay.

American prosperity from the end of the first World War until 1929 was based in part on American sales to Europe at American prices and paid for by American purchase of foreign bonds.

Basically, the second World War caught America still suffering from a depression which had lasted from 1929, when this method of financing had failed. European war preparation gave American industry the stimulus it had lacked, that is, a European market as well as a home market. But the same basic disparity between American wages and prices and European wages and prices would have stripped England and France clean and permitted Germany to win the war had we not agreed under Lend-Lease to supply their needs and talk about payment later.

PRICES IN WARTIME

Under Lend-Lease there was no pressure to keep prices down, let alone force them down, until we entered the war. Then all pressures were exercised in the direction of raising prices of war goods. As far as possible prices of goods to civilians were held down. Wages to war workers were materially higher than they had ever been. This, in part, was intended to drain workers from civilian industry into war industries and it succeeded. In addition it tended to raise wages, particularly in the lowest brackets, in civilian industry as well. Throughout industry the continuous employment that employees always wanted was generally sustained.

At least there seems to be some connection between American prosperity and American ability to find European markets. It is true also that European purchasers cannot pay American prices. This apparently gives Americans the choice of finding methods of reducing prices or subsidizing exports.

With the end of war America's two primary aims are demobilization and continuous employment. Nevertheless, one of our first moves was to end Lend-Lease. One of our next is apparently going to be a determined effort to sustain take-home pay of war workers at about the same level for 40 hours as it has been for 48 hours.

Another has been to increase unemployment benefits and to talk about generally increasing the groups covered by the various types of social security insurance.

We have the largest bonded indebtedness and the largest governmental establishment this country has ever had. The costs of carrying both must come out of each year's annual income, so they must be added to prices of industrial products. If our plants run 40 hours instead of 48, taxes will take a proportionately higher part

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the gross proceeds of industry. If, instead of 40 hours, industry should run 32 hours, the tax burden will be proportionately higher.

Should an annual wage bill be passed, this too will have a tendency to raise prices. In the case of any specific man, or of any specific industry, a policy may be advantageous, which, if followed to its logical conclusion for all men and all industries, might well be disastrous. The American policy of restricting production to raise prices may have reached that point in 1929.

Certainly during the depression years we occasionally subsidized products for home consumption. We also subsidized wheat and cotton in the foreign markets, particularly the exportation of wheat to China. Great as is the disparity between European and American wages and prices, Asiatic and American disparity is even greater.

Although wages are a vital factor in prices, they are not the only factor. Wages might be increased without price increases in some industries; automobile workers have already declared that automobile wages could be increased 30 per cent without any increase in the price of cars. This again would depend in part upon the total number of cars made and sold.

If, however, the automobile workers are concerned with annual wages they should at least consider the possibility that a reduction in the price of cars would be more to their interest than an increase in their wages. This, too, would depend upon the total number of cars made and sold and upon the ratio of price reduction to wages. That is, a reduction of 30 per cent in prices would seem to be unattainable, but a reduction of 10 per cent might be possible and it might be possible to estimate how many more cars can be sold at $900 than at $1,000.

This is not a suggested immediate step for either the automobile workers or for the automobile industry. It is a suggestion for a different approach than either industry or trade unions have made to the problem of sustained employment. It is the open acknowledgment of the fact that America must find some foreign markets. We must try to extend our home markets, not by competition in services, or in financing charges, or in any of the subsidiary functions of production, but by a frank effort to sell more goods through reduced prices. Prices can be reduced with least harm when restrictive practices are discontinued. One of the first of such practices is over-pricing both of labor and of goods.

* * *

● There is still some doubt whether or not Admiral Halsey will get to ride the Emperor's white horse. When Admiral Spruance was asked about it, the Fifth Fleet Commander saw two possible difficulties. "I don't know whether the Emperor's white horse survived the bombing. And," he added with a twinkle, "I also don't know how long it has been since Halsey has ridden a white horse."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Taxes: The Treasury View

By Alzada Comstock

Professor of Economics, Mount Holyoke College

WHEN the incredulous surprise at the surrender of the Japanese turned into certainty, the lightening of taxes was one of the many reliefs from war burdens for which the American public asked. This demand was reflected by members of Congress even before the two houses reconvened after their holiday. It is not generally realized, however, that the Treasury has shared this point of view, and that for some time its policy has been directed toward lower and easier taxes for business and for the individual taxpayer.

The Secretary of the Treasury and the officials associated with him must, to be sure, keep in mind many considerations. They cannot stop with finding revenue adequate for the government's needs. They must work for a tax system which is fair in its distribution of the tax burden, is relatively easy of administration, produces a willingness to cooperate on the part of taxpayers and fits the social and economic situation of the times; and this last, even in a relatively stable country like our own, is subject to frequent and rapid changes.

Throughout the final year of the term of Mr. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., as Secretary of the Treasury and now under Mr. Fred M. Vinson, the tax expert turned administrator, the machinery for adjusting taxes to reconversion needs has been revolving. In June, 1944, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation adopted two resolutions in this field. The first called upon the committee's staff, in collaboration with the Treasury, to make a study of postwar taxation. The second requested assistance from the Senate Finance Committee and the House Committee on Ways and Means in studying taxation in the postwar period.

Accordingly a joint committee on internal revenue taxation for post war taxation was set up, with equal representation for both parties. The tax staffs of the Joint Committee and the Treasury held conferences with representatives of the country's leading economic groups, some of which were themselves studying postwar taxation, and attacked the problems of the transitional and postwar periods.

Early in 1945, with V-E day in sight, Secretary Morgenthau for the first time endorsed selective tax reductions in the postwar period. This was in his annual report to Congress on the state of the country's finances, published on February 14. These modifica-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions, he said, were "essential to the realization of full employment in a peace-time economy of free enterprise and competition." It was not clear how far Mr. Morgenthau would go, for in the same report he urged that in the post-war period the national debt be reduced as far as is compatible with maintaining full employment.

By May 10 the Joint Committee working on postwar taxation was ready to report, and Secretary Morgenthau, Chairman George of the Senate Finance Committee and Chairman Doughton of the House Ways and Means Committee held a press conference at which they made public their recommendations for an increase in the excess profits tax specific exemption from $10,000 to $25,000 in the tax year 1946 and for other changes to aid business, particularly small business, in the reconversion period. These were approved by both houses of Congress, but the country was still in the dark about the government's peace-time tax plans.

When Mr. Morgenthau resigned as Secretary of the Treasury in July, 1945, he issued a summary report covering the chief events and achievements of his administration and setting forth the connection he foresaw in the reconversion period between the country's state of economic health and the taxpayers' burdens. The retiring Secretary of the Treasury saw one alternative as follows:

> If reconversion ushers in a period of stagnant unemployment, retrenchment and an economy of scarcity, the cost of government will bear heavily on the depleted income of the taxpayer regardless of tax rates. With a withering national income, tax receipts will fall. These problems will be intensified by the task of servicing our huge national debt growing out of the war.

Historical evidence supports the logic of this argument. As the great depression filtered through this country, federal tax receipts dropped from about three billion dollars in 1930-1931 (or "fiscal '31," as Treasury officials usually put it) to about two billion dollars in the succeeding fiscal year.

Mr. Morgenthau sounded, too, a little like ex-President Hoover's Secretary of the Treasury, Ogden L. Mills, who wrote in his report for the year ending June 30, 1932: "In a period of deep depression, with the income of the people greatly reduced, with their buying power drastically curtailed, and with millions deprived of their earning capacity, it is not only unwise but impossible to bridge the gap in the budget entirely by increased taxation." However, Mr. Mills' corollary, the reduction of government expenditures, was not followed by the Hoover administration. It has since been the subject of prolonged attack by believers in cyclical, not annual, budget-balancing.

To return to Mr. Morgenthau's valedictory words: his second alternative was expressed as follows:

> On the other hand, the cost of government—including the servicing of our public debt—can be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

met with substantially lower taxes if incomes are high and business is good. Incomes will be high and business will be good if this country undertakes a speedy postwar reconversion accompanied by intelligent protection for the wage-earners' pay envelopes, stability in farm prices and reasonable profits for business.

Here again experience within our memory supports the argument. The prosperous years of the twenties show satisfactory parallels, although the uncertainties of agriculture and technological unemployment, glossed over in the years of good prices, produced a less utopian situation than the one for which Mr. Morgenthau hoped.

SILENCE ON DETAILS

But the wartime Secretary of the Treasury stopped short of anything approaching detail. He had nothing to say of the use of specific taxes when the period of reconversion is accomplished, say after two or three years. He was silent on debt reduction policy. Evidently he was so fully preoccupied with full employment and the resulting large volume of consumer demand as the key to prosperity that he was content to let fiscal measures be molded to the situation as it developed.

Nor was Secretary Vinson, in his first weeks in office, any easier to pin down on the questions which citizens who are becoming adjusted to peace are beginning to ask. In August, as guest writer for a Washington columnist, he chose instead to emphasize the campaign to halt tax evasion, the extent of which he found surprising. Mr. Vinson gave a billion dollars as the sum which Mr. Morgenthau had thought could be collected from evaders if the Treasury could have an adequate number of skilled new workers. That sum is appreciable, but the contemplation of it does little to answer the deeper questions.

The awesome facts of our fiscal history in the depression and war periods can be briefly summarized. For 15 years now, beginning in 1930-31, our federal budget has shown a large annual deficit. Since the gap between expenditures and receipts has been met by borrowing, the national debt has been correspondingly swollen. From its post-World War I low point of 16 billions in fiscal '30 it has grown to 259 billions at the end of June, 1945. In the last year alone the increase was 58 billion.

In 1944-45 government expenditures for the first time passed 100 billion dollars. It was because slightly less than half of this could be met by taxes and other government income that the 58 billion had to be borrowed.

The worst is over, but the way is still rough with coming deficits. At the end of August the head of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Harold P. Smith, gave a statement in which federal expenditures for the current year, as revised because of the surrender of Japan, were put at only two-thirds of last year's. About half of this will be deficit, to be met by the addition

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of some 30 billion more to the national debt already outstanding.

Although we have not quite succeeded in paying for half of our war costs by taxes—and are repeatedly reminded that Canada has done better—the volume of more than 46 billion paid in fiscal '45 is impressive and no apology to the world is needed for our tax rates. The war has seen individual income tax exemptions cut, combined normal and surtax rates applicable to the lowest surtax bracket increased from 8 to 23 per cent, and the top rate increased from 79 per cent to 94 per cent (with a 90 per cent limit on the total effective rate). The corporation standard income tax rate has gone from 19 per cent to 40 per cent. A new excess profits tax has been adopted, at a present gross rate of 95 per cent and a net rate of 85.5 per cent. Liquor, cigarette and many other consumption taxes have been increased beyond all anticipation.

These, taken together, have been heavy burdens; and it was to be expected that the first weeks of peace should see a popular movement directed towards lifting the load. But the efforts have been regrettably helter-skelter. Apparently any tax reduction will do, with no need to bother about estimating the relief to the citizen, the loss to the Treasury, the influence of the change in producing a sound peace-time system, and only the loosest of reference to employment and purchasing power.

Small blame attaches to members of Congress who heed the clamor, for it has long been an axiom of political life that there are few vote-getters as effective as a promise to reduce taxes. The proposal of Senator Knutson of Minnesota on August 27 to make a 20 per cent cut in income taxes from the bottom to the top had at least the merit of ease of comprehension, although it offered no new simplicity of computation.

The work of tax reduction belongs to Congress, acting in large part through the House Ways and Means Committee, the Senate Finance Committee and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation with its staff of experts. Nevertheless it is a loss to the voting and taxpaying public that, as the work gets under way, so little should be heard from the Treasury. It is a time when almost any proposal may capture the imagination and become a political weapon for or against one Congressman or another.

OFFICIAL FISCAL POLICY

Some light on the government's fiscal policy does come, however, from the official plan for full employment. The idea is that budget-balancing is achieved, not when Treasury receipts meet government expenses, but when work is available for all who need it, a plan sponsored by Senator Murray of Montana which is apparently in line with the policy of President Truman and the members of the Cabinet.

Such a plan would use government projects and funds to push

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the gross national product to the necessary point if private sources of expenditure could not achieve it. Tax reduction to free individual incomes for commercial spending would be an important part of the effort to stimulate private industry. Government guarantee of loans, public works and social security expansion would push the job budget the rest of the way.

Here again a zone of silence surrounds the old-fashioned questions: what will be the size of those familiar Treasury figures of receipts and expenditures? What should we do about the enormous national debt? What taxes are fair in the 1946 economy, and why?

For many months private corporations, foundations and individuals have been offering contributions on these subjects which they have hoped will find favor in Washington. About a year ago there was a veritable spate of postwar budgets inundating the country, with a range of 15 to 25 billion dollars for expenditures. These were carefully done, on traditional lines, with the general assumption that tax reductions would give the stimulus for high employment and that little else would be necessary.

There followed a lull in the offering of budgets. But the fiscal theorists (the most conspicuous of whom have had considerable experience in "practical" affairs) have not allowed their industry to falter since its stimulation in the early days of the New Deal. Professor Alvin Hansen of Harvard has consistently soothed public apprehension about the size of the national debt, on the grounds that a debt owed to ourselves keeps money circulating in the country and that too rapid repayment might produce deflation.

At the other end of the scale is Professor Harley L. Lutz of Princeton, who has been one of the severest of the government's critics since the spring of 1933. In *Guide Posts to a Free Economy*, published in September, 1944, Professor Lutz attacks progressive taxation, current debt policy, much of the social security program, all forms of economic planning and all national expenditures therefor. He would abandon the "short cut to serfdom" along which our "totalitarian planners" are shoving us and adopt instead this rule: "If you want to make a dollar by any honest means you are free to try, and if you succeed you may keep it."

Somehow or other the average citizen must find his way out before the next voting day comes. On the one hand he is bothered by the fact that from the beginning Americans have never really been happy with bills hanging over their heads. On the other hand, he is either amused or irritated by the let-us-return-to-the-good-old-days school, for his daily life has been well jostled by recent industrial change. He would be immeasurably helped by hearing his questions discussed coolly and reasonably by his President, his Cabinet, his Treasury, his Senators and his Congressmen.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Does "Full Employment" Include Jobs for 18 Million Women?

Women in the Post-War Labor Market

By Gladys L. Palmer

Industrial Research Associate, University of Pennsylvania

A POST-V-J Day news headline noting that 1,000 workers have been laid off from the Washington Navy Yard, with the detail that almost all of them are women, dramatizes the effect of the end of the war on employment of women. It raises important questions about the status of women in the post-war labor market. Will the 18 million women employed at the peak of war production expect jobs after the war? Will they be able to maintain any of the beachheads gained in occupations formerly reserved for men? Or is the battle of the sexes to be revived by a generally accepted program to "get rid of the women"? Do plans for full employment after the war include women workers?

At the peak of the war effort when labor shortages threatened to impede war production in many industries and areas, women workers were in great demand. They secured jobs at higher wages than those prevailing in the industries in which they usually worked. Many women were upgraded to more responsible jobs or were trained in new types of work throughout industry. They replaced men who left to enter the armed forces or who took more responsible jobs. On V-E Day, 18 million women were at work, 6½ million more than were employed in May, 1940. A third of this addition to the group of employed women came from the ranks of the unemployed who were searching for jobs in 1940. There were, in addition, normal entrants to the labor market between 1940 and 1945 as girls graduated from school and college. But about half of the total, or three million, were former housewives or retired workers who entered or re-entered the labor market and recruits from school-age groups who in pre-war years would have stayed in school.

If the increase in the number of women workers during the war were distributed evenly throughout the United States, no special problems would be created in post-war years. The difficulty is that the expansion of employment during the war has been localized in war industry centers and the unemployment following the war will also be localized. This is true both for men and for women, but women are, in general, less mobile than men. Family ties and responsibilities prevent women from pulling up stakes and moving to another area when lay-offs occur. Women workers may contribute

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all or a large part of their earnings to the family income, but if the male wage-earners' contribution is larger because of generally higher levels of pay for men, then the family is tied to the place from which most of the family income is derived. Even for unmarried workers, social custom prevents young women from moving about the country in search of work opportunity at the same degree that is expected of young men. Although it is anticipated that there will be a large volume of out-migration of workers and their families from war-congested communities in the next few months, the direction of this movement will be largely determined by pre-war or new work opportunities for men rather than for women.

Recent opinion poll results applied to national totals indicate that 65 per cent of all women at work during the war expect to continue to work after the war. Special studies by the Women's Bureau of women at work in important war industry centers, such as Buffalo and Detroit, however, indicate that this is an understatement. In these cities, 75 or 80 per cent expect to stay in the labor market. At least 60 per cent of the women at work during the war in these cities had worked before Pearl Harbor and a significant proportion of those who had not worked before the war indicated a desire to stay in the labor market. This is particularly true for younger women who left school before graduation to take jobs but who do not expect to return to school. In every city surveyed, more women want jobs in factories and offices than were employed in these activities prior to the war.

OBSTACLES TO WORK

During the reconversion period, there are important obstacles to women remaining at work. Veterans are returning in constantly increasing numbers and they are entitled to their old jobs or to new jobs. Lay-offs and rehiring will take place largely on the basis of seniority, and since many women are newcomers to the jobs held during the war, their seniority is generally lower than that of men. In some plants, moreover, women have had only "temporary" status for the war period and are therefore out of a job when reductions in the work force occur. Perhaps more important than these factors will be the general attitude of labor and management in the shops. Whenever large-scale unemployment occurs in industries where women are relative newcomers or constitute a minority of the total employed, antagonism develops to their continuing to hold jobs. Regardless of their qualifications for the work or seniority rights, if the men decide to get rid of the women, there are countless ways of doing it. This happened after the last war and during the depression of the thirties, and appears to be in the offing now, if one can judge from the amount of discussion about whether women have a place in the shops.

Although personal prejudices may enter into the raising of this question, the major considerations

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are fear on the part of the majority of workers that there will not be enough jobs for all persons who may need or want work and a widespread misunderstanding on the part of the public with respect to the role of women workers in the economy. The fear of mass unemployment, which constitutes a terrible scourge in all walks of life, can only be assuaged by experience under high employment levels over a period of years. The misunderstanding with respect to the contribution and special problems of women workers needs to be clarified whether we have high or low employment levels after the war.

This misunderstanding arises from confusion with respect to the experience of the individual and that of the group. The majority of men enter the labor market after leaving school or college and stay in the labor market until they have the resources with which to retire. The majority of women do not. A very high proportion of women in the younger age-groups is in the labor market but many of these retire at marriage. A significant proportion, however, works after marriage, continuously or intermittently, throughout their lives. Social custom, levels of family incomes and work opportunity all affect the proportion of married women in the labor market in any place at a given time. Most single women, and many widowed or divorced women, on the other hand, are continuously in the labor market. For these reasons, the group of women in the labor market is not composed of the same individuals over time to the extent that this is true of men.

Special problems in improving working conditions for women are created by the changing composition of the female labor force. Since it is not composed of the same individuals, year in and year out, the female labor force has high turnover, and, at any given time, contains a relatively large proportion of young and inexperienced workers, most of whom do not expect to spend the rest of their lives in the labor market. This characteristic should be regarded as a challenge to school programs and to the educational work of labor unions. Regardless of whether the individuals stay in the labor market or not, their experience, while there, will influence their own and their families' attitudes, both economic and political, for years to come.

Men in labor unions fear that women will undercut their wage scales but wage scales are undercut whenever there are unemployed workers in need of jobs, whether they are men or women. Women do not work for low wages because they prefer low wages. If they get pushed out of high-wage jobs, they will take whatever is open, just as men do. One of the reasons why the industries which customarily employ large numbers of women have low wage-scales is that the competition for jobs among women has been intensified by their exclusion from other industries.

Historical perspective may help to clarify the role of women work-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ers in the economy. Despite the rapid demobilization of women from war plants after the last war and the legal restrictions and hiring practices which discouraged women from working during the depression, the number of women in the labor market steadily increased between 1920 and 1940, both relatively and absolutely. They were not all the same individuals as were employed during World War I, but those who left the labor market during this period were replaced by others, and the total number continued to increase. This increase was associated with rising national income and improved standards of living, education, and leisure, and higher rates of retirement for older workers, both men and women. Women's work made an important contribution to this long-term economic development, just as it has made an emergency contribution to war production and services. The nation would have been the poorer if this work had not been performed. It would have been the richer if all persons seeking jobs, both men and women, could have held jobs commensurate with their skills and ability in all of the years between the two wars.

If there had been no war in this decade, the Bureau of the Census estimates there would be 17 million women in the labor force in 1950, as compared with 13 million in 1940. This estimate is based on pre-war trends and patterns in labor-market participation for specific age-groups and makes no allowance for any permanent increase as a direct result of the war. Numerous studies indicate that many women who did not work before the war prefer to stay in the labor market, if they can. A conservative estimate of this group is one million. This would mean that there will be at least 18 million women in the labor market in 1950 but it should be noted that they will not necessarily be the same 18 million who were at work during the war.

The future status of 18 million women cannot be dismissed with a wave of the hand or statistical legerdemain. Women are therefore asking these questions: for whom is full employment being planned and are there 18 million jobs for women in these plans? Women's stake in full employment programs is as great or greater than that of any other single group because the full impact of reconversion unemployment with the necessary adjustments to peace-time jobs is likely to be relatively more severe for women than for men.

Direct and indirect evidence is already available to indicate that the women laid off from war plants are not being re-absorbed as fast as men. In recent months, the rate of unemployment has been higher for women than for men, unemployed women in receipt of compensation benefits have had a higher average duration of benefit than men, and relatively more women than men have exhausted benefit rights. Although shutdowns after cancellations of war contracts prior to V-E Day were followed by the withdrawal of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some women from the labor market and the migration of families to other areas, women who stayed in the areas affected to look for work secured jobs relatively slowly.

There are special hurdles which unemployed women have to clear in order to obtain unemployment compensation benefits. Women who quit their jobs are considered to have left the labor force unless they give proof to the contrary. In 14 states, women are disqualified by statute if they leave work to marry and 3 states disqualify women who quit work to move to another locality with their husbands or families. Besides this type of legal and administrative hurdle, women, in general, receive lower compensation than men because more women are employed at low wage levels as compared with men. There are also legal disqualifications for old age insurance which prevent many women who work a large part of their lives from being fully insured. It may be questioned, therefore, whether, under existing legislation, women have adequate social insurance protection or even protection commensurate with their tax contributions.

In the immediate reconversion period, the adequacy of unemployment compensation benefits and of facilities for vocational counselling, guidance and placement will be important factors in easing the adjustment problems of women workers. In the longer-term post-war period, only high levels of employment can assure women a secure place in the labor market and in the economy. These are important factors in the post-war status of all workers, but absolutely essential for women. The United States is the only country in the world that can afford to have so *few* of its women at work, in peace or in war. The high productivity of American workers, including women, and the efficiency of American management create the national income which permits a relatively high proportion of our population to live on someone else's work. As a result, all of us are under an obligation to encourage rather than discourage the women in the post-war labor force.

* * *

● A way has at last been found to beat standing in queues. Eighteen veterans got tired one day of standing in line for their state $100 bonuses, so they marched up to the state treasurer's office and applied for jobs as typists, examiners and clerks in the department handling the bonuses.

* * *

● A soldier who had returned to civilian life wrote as follows to his officer: "Sir: After what I have suffered in the past two years it gives me great pleasure to tell you to go to hell."
In due course he received the following reply:
"Sir: Any suggestions or inquiries concerning movements of military personnel must be entered on form MF-3412, a copy of which is enclosed."

—*Reformatory Pillar*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Unreconstructed Old-Timer

By Charles Fisher

From his column in The Philadelphia Record

LIKE many another important project, the reconversion of Fisher to peace-time production has been held up during the past few weeks, but we aren't loath to give our devoted clients advance information on the plans.

Those who expect the New Fisher to be equipped with neon lights and built-in FM are bound to be disappointed. Nor will the postwar model have increased speed or, we regret to say, better brakes. We doubt if it will soar very far off the ground, and it's almost certain that the fan belt will continue to slip, thus generating needlessly high temperatures during election campaigns.

In fact, there will be something familiar about the old hack and there is where we expect to cash in. When everything else is oddly enmeshed in glass brick and encumbered with plastic streamlining, the customers can turn in relief to Good Old Fisher—still raising his cry of Back to McKinley!

Our No. 1 postwar plan is to coddle a long-standing reluctance to flit about in airplanes. There is a practical reason behind this attitude, aside from the fact that we're not usually in much of a hurry to get any place. You see, when everyone else has taken to the air, we will have all the automobile roads in the world to ourself. We'll have to be careful, though, being the only remaining reason for traffic cops' existence. The competition to give us tickets will be pretty intense.

We are also determined to campaign ferociously against the notion of buying meals frozen fast to a paper plate and sitting by, fork in hand, whilst they are thawed by electronics or some such outlandish device. In our heart frozen victuals will never take the place of the old-fashioned can opener. Heinz and Campbell were good enough for our grandparents—remember the spicy kitchen, with the bright rows of cans lined up along the shelf? — and they're good enough for us!

Television is another newfangled mechanism against which we mean to turn the deadly rat-tat-tat of our air-cooled Underwood. What's the matter with quaint old radio? Is the world to move so far ahead that it will forget the wholesome, instructive entertainment of Jack Benny and John's Other Wife? (We don't mean to suggest anything amiss between Mr. Benny and John's Other Wife; the names just happened to be put down together.)

Do people realize that television will destroy the traditional

© 1945, by The Philadelphia Record, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

educational processes of the young? Statistics show—we know they show, because we made 'em up—that 99.99 per cent of the children of the nation do their homework with an eye on the arithmetic book and an ear tuned to the radio, which is emitting a whimsical tale about Bloodbucket Bill and the ghouls. It has taken years of breeding to produce a generation which doesn't let its ears know what its eyes are doing. Once the competing entertainment comes on a screen instead of out of a horn, the arithmetic book won't stand a chance at all.

We don't know what they plan to do to the movies, but it's probably something pretty alarming. The movies already have action and color, and they talk, and there doesn't seem to be much left to add. Of course, the chorus girls could come out of the musicals and sit on the laps of the audience . . . Come to think of it, maybe we'd be a little hasty campaigning against the movies. Skip that one.

But there will be enough other improvements to engage our disapproving attention most days, and to assure our fellow reactionaries that there is at least one small piece of earth which is still trying to move backward. We're so set on the old ways that we still believe in the old idea—it dates all the way back to Wilson and '19—that a group of nations can come together and settle their difficult business without war. We're going to be a pretty enthusiastic reactionary about that one.

* * *

● American Legion headquarters disclosed recently that Fighting Dogs, veterans of the K-9 Corps, had been ruled ineligible for membership.

—ANS Newsdispatch

Well, that's one organization that's not going to the dogs.

* * *

● She was so nice that she worked all of her crossword puzzles vertically so she wouldn't have to come across.

—Port-O'-Call

* * *

● Boris M. Joffe, budget officer of the War Labor Board, has set up these qualifications for the budget and administrative officers in government. He says they need:

The eye of a hawk
The memory of an elephant
The nose of a bloodhound
The vigilance of an owl
The voice of a dove
The sagacity of a Solomon
The patience of a Job
And the imperturbability of the Sphinx.

—Jerry Kluz, in The Washington Post

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Peace As a Common Enterprise

By Barnet Nover

From his column in The Washington Post

IN his first speech as Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons, Winston Churchill spoke bitterly of the "iron curtain which at present divides Europe in twain."

For some time, and particularly since the Crimea Conference, the United States and Great Britain have been trying to get that curtain lifted. So far their success has been limited. There is still a vast area in Eastern Europe that remains effectively cut off from the rest of the continent.

Nonetheless, enough information has filtered through from the closed zone to indicate that disturbing developments have been taking place there. Churchill suggests that in the German area occupied by the Polish provisional government a mass expulsion of millions of Germans has been carried out, despite the fact that the border between Poland and Germany is yet to be finally delimited.

Elsewhere in Eastern Europe, according to Ernest Bevin, the new British Foreign Secretary, "one kind of totalitarianism is being replaced by another."

Bevin was referring particularly to Bulgaria, Hungary and Rumania but he might also have added Yugoslavia to the list. In all those countries the Crimea agreement has been set aside or held in abeyance.

There can be no doubt that our government takes the same unfavorable view of the regimes now operating in the Balkans. In a note to Bulgaria on August 18, Secretary Byrnes declared that:

"The information available to the United States government has not satisfied it that the existing provisional Bulgarian government is adequately representative of the important elements of democratic opinion or that the existing government has arranged for the scheduled elections to take place under conditions which will allow and ensure the effective participation therein, free from the fear of force and intimidation, of all democratic elements."

The fact is that we have a very real stake in the development of truly democratic institutions in areas freed from the Nazi yoke. American blood and treasure were spent lavishly in winning that common victory without which Europe could not have been liberated. Our stake in Europe's future is great and incontestable.

Yet we cannot stop merely with manifesting a political interest in Europe.

The forms of government that will emerge in Europe will de-

© 1945, by The Washington Post, Washington, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pend to a determining degree on the economic situation that obtains in the various countries. A state of hunger and want and deprivation are certainly not conducive to the establishment or the perpetuation of democracy in lands where democracy has been only a frail plant, anyway.

Yet, at the moment, hunger and want and deprivation are widespread in Europe today. The war demoralized the once highly integrated transportation system of the continent. There is a very disturbing shortage of food and fuel.

It was with this in mind that Ernest Bevin, in his maiden speech as Foreign Secretary, urged the miners of Britain to mine more coal and thus help in the task of "building peace and bringing succor, help and warmth to millions of their fellow-workers at home and abroad."

In this rehabilitation and reconstruction and relief effort the United States cannot be behind.

The abrupt stoppage of lend-lease shipments may have been made inevitable by official assurance given Congress at the time the Lend-Lease Act was up for renewal.

Nonetheless, the fact must be recognized that the effect of this action, with no substitute arrangement available or likely to be put into effect for some time, will be to increase Europe's economic distress. In the case of Great Britain, where 10 per cent of all lend-lease shipments was in the form of foodstuffs, the consequences may very well prove disastrous.

The war was a common enterprise and was so recognized by the passage of the Lend-Lease Act. Is peace any less of a common enterprise? If we decide to consult our own interests exclusively and follow a policy of "the devil take the hindmost," we shall have taken the first step on the road to undoing what at so tremendous a price we have only just achieved.

* * *

● The youngster had been told that his dad, in the air force, was going deer hunting. "Oh," he said, "I suppose he's going to bombardier."

—Eleanor Clarage in The Cleveland Plain Dealer

* * *

● Believe it or not, there is a twenty-year-old Society for the Prevention of Parsley on Food. One of its members advises how to promote the cause:

"When parsley is served in a home, remove it with the air of picking a worm out of a salad and drop it on the butter plate. In restaurants, on the tablecloth . . . always accompanied by a pained expression. . . . The Chicago Journal of Commerce reports that after the war parsley will be made of plastics so that it can be washed and used over and over again . . . as it is merely decoration and not fit to eat."

—Mark Beltaire in The Detroit Free Press

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Peace!

By Anne O'Hare McCormick

From her column "Abroad" in The New York Times

PEACE. The world breathes today as it has not breathed for six years. During all that time people everywhere, victors and vanquished, have lived and died for this day. It was the terminus of all their thoughts because they could not see beyond it. They existed from day to day, working, fighting, enduring, falling, but always waiting—waiting for the end.

For governments peace means the success or failure of aims and policies of which war was the ultimate instrument. Today it also means individual punishment for rulers who resorted to this murderous method of attaining their ends; for the first time in history the war-makers are to be tried for war as a crime. But for ordinary people it means that the slaughter is over. It means the recovery of the future, for there was no future for anyone until the future of the world was settled.

Peace is the promise of return to some sort of personal life. In war free men learn a little of what it is to live under systems where there are no choices. Peace is release, not merely from danger and destruction, from loss and the agony of suspense, but from a subjection to one end as restrictive as the discipline of the soldier.

There has never been a peace like this because there never was a war like this. It was war in which women and children, cities and farmlands, were on the firing line. The populations spared from bombardment, like our own, were like conscript armies, mobilized to man the supply lines.

Total war, unhappily, does not end in total peace. It is too destructive, too inhuman. The ruin, exhaustion and despair left behind by a struggle of such ruthlessness mine the road back to tranquility with time bombs that have to be handled with firmness and dispatch.

But at last governments can put their minds on these problems. They can be considered in the political instead of the military context. The statesmen can take on where the soldiers leave off. They don't have to think of Poland or the Straits, Trieste or Korea, in terms of this war, or as if the next war is going to be the same war. Even if the United Nations organization has not changed the old conceptions of security, the atomic bomb will. That little ball of all-consuming fire proves again what men are slow to understand—that the revolutions of the streets or even of the battlefield are only belated and messy sequels to the

© 1945, by The New York Times, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revolutions already made in the laboratories.

And at last people can begin planning for the use of their own energies. They can dream as they have not dreamed in these war-bound years—of building a house, of bringing up children in safety, of starting a business, of going places again, of open seas and peaceful skies. It is of little labors and renewed hopes that peace will be rebuilt. The men who sit at council tables drawing boundaries and moving people as if they were fence posts will get nowhere unless they remember that to human beings liberation means freedom to live their own lives.

They will get nowhere on propaganda, for they take over a world fed up on propaganda. "The people are weary of declarations, speeches, pronouncements and promises," writes a Frenchman. The victors will be judged only by their deeds, and this is true likewise of the governments set up in the liberated countries and of the administration imposed on conquered nations. We are going to live for years in the embers of the war and governments are going to walk on live coals.

It will be hard to make peace out of weariness, anger, hunger, cynicism and inertia. But these are only the dregs of war, and to fail to wipe out the dragon's tracks when the dragon himself is slain is to belittle our own power and betray the faith of those who have won us the opportunity to make peace.

This seems to be the time to publish excerpts from two letters written during the past year by men in the fighting service. One is from a Canadian public relations officer: "I pray and hope that I may find the strength to hold close to my duty. I mention praying because in reporting the acts, feelings and visions of fighting men I am close to what these men believe they are fighting for and what they hope from the world after the war. This is not very articulate, yet I can tell you that there can hardly be peace for generations ahead if this generation is frustrated of its aspirations. They will never rest if anyone cheats them of their dream of making life safer and better."

The second is from an American airman who is not here to celebrate the peace: "I'm on the Vienna run now. I don't like the job, but I do it well because the good Viennese must prefer bombing to living forever under the Nazis. If I did not think we were going to set these people free and make a world safe and fit for decent people to live in, it wouldn't be worth it. The fellows in our outfit don't talk much, but every once in a while they say something that shows what they feel about this war. What it's all about, I mean. They are going to blow the Nazis off the planet. But that's not enough. We want a different kind of world. No more fireworks, a good long peace, American-made, please, and a little help on the comeback over here."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Offensive for the Future

By Major George Fielding Eliot

From his column in The New York Herald-Tribune

THE facts of life have caught up with us again. We are not pleased. We Americans built a little nest 'way out in the west and let the rest of the world go by. We would, most of us, much prefer that it would continue going by, but things haven't worked out that way.

Just as the isolated settler in the old west found the march of civilization, with all its community problems, eventually catching up with him, so we in our secure ocean-guarded continent suddenly find ourselves living in the very center of the world community, with all its infinitely more complicated problems. What is more, we are the strongest and most influential member of the community, and so we are loaded with the largest share of the work and responsibility. Obviously, our first job is to re-adjust our thinking.

Take the pressing need for decision about the size and nature of our postwar armed forces. Military policy, we know, must go hand in hand with foreign policy. Your policies and interests are thus-and-so. Consequently, you have such and such potential enemies; their strength is such and such, and it will take them so long to get ready to do you injury. Therefore you must have so many men, so many ships, such an industrial mobilization program.

But no. That's pre-war thinking. That's pre-atom thinking. That's pre-rocket thinking. You can't use the words "national defense" any more. You can't dare to think in terms of "hemispheric defense," even. Defense, if it comes to that, is your finish. Look what happened to Germany once that nation was reduced to the defensive. Look what happened to Japan because the Japanese leaders thought they could grab half a world and then sit tight and defend it.

The life principle in war is the offensive principle. But it is the life principle, also, in all human activities. As long as you are up and doing, you are going somewhere. When you sit back and say, "I'm satisfied," you're already on the decline.

Are we, then, to be constantly on the offensive in our relations with other states? Yes, in the sense that we must be constantly at war with war itself and with the conditions which make war possible. We must be eternally vigilant, eternally and actively seeking out and destroying the causes of war, the planners of war, the very seeds from which war's evil weeds may grow.

We are afraid of the forces we

1945, by New York Tribune, Inc., New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have let loose in the world. We are reasonably certain that our own people will continue to think like that, but we are not yet as certain of everyone else. So we will unquestionably begin to press harder and harder for the extension of our ideals, for more and more of the four freedoms.

The grim fact is that the influence of any people in the affairs of this world is based almost altogether upon power. The very fact that we and our British and Canadian cousins are for the moment the sole trustees of atomic weapons gives us a temporary position of great potentiality; but we must use it wisely and fairly, not for selfish advantage, but toward the ultimate good of all: peace and justice under law.

Atoms and Property Rights

By Jay Franklin

From his column "We the People" in The Cleveland Plain Dealer

THE release of atomic energy, which gives us both a terrible weapon and an incalculable source of industrial power for the future, being the result of social investment by three independent governments, makes necessary a redistribution of property rights.

The atomic bomb, and the continuing research which developed it, creates an enormous new source of wealth on a level above the capacity of private enterprise, as normally understood, to invest and develop. The major industrial corporations of the three nations which contributed to the development could not between them have afforded two billion dollars in six years, let alone the many millions which must be spent over the next 10 or 20 years to expand this discovery into constructive channels. Control by three governments is assurance that it cannot be suppressed or diverted by any one of them. England's Labor government alone would make it certain that this instrumentality be not turned over to private cartels and monopolies.

This fact has tremendous implications for the institution of property in the future. The Marxists, being infected with Hegelian philosophy, might assert that atomic energy involves the abolition of private enterprise. Anglo-Saxons will draw different conclusions. This is Gettysburg and not Waterloo. Private property as represented by industrial corporations is hereby reduced to the level of a secondary economic activity. Private property as represented by individual ownership of houses, farms, etc., is relegated to a third level.

This does not mean the abolition of private property, any more

1945, Consolidated News Features, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than Gettysburg and Appomattox meant that states rights had been abolished. It is only that they ceased to be the controlling factor and subsequently tended to confine themselves to those political powers which the federal government did not care to take over.

Since atomic energy is new, prophecy is permissable.

What seems most probable to emerge from the present wave of socialism, with this social investment as its capstone, is an ordering of property rights just as the American Constitution established an ordering of political rights.

At the top will be social property, administered, owned or controlled by governments in the interest of all the people. Next will come a wide range of industrial property, under private ownership in form and under public regulation in fact. This group of property rights may well come to resemble state rights in the political sphere. Finally, there will be private property rights which are reserved to the people as individuals, ownership of houses, clothes, automobiles, yachts, farms, theatres, etc. Broadly speaking, social property will be the controlling element and the other forms of property will represent economic institutions which social ownership finds too difficult or too localized to administer efficiently.

This is the greatest single monument to Roosevelt's foresight. Atomic energy came into practical being at a level which forbids that it be subverted or suppressed by private industrial interests. They blocked him on the St. Lawrence and at Passamaquoddy, but he won the greatest scientific jackpot of all time by pushing through the atomic research, using war finance, war man power, TVA hydro-electric power, Canadian uranium ore.

In this impending re-ordering of property rights, the great industrial corporations which contributed to the atomic bomb may logically become the licensees or subagents of the various governments for commercial utilization of the powers which have been or will be released.

* * *

● Our Favorite Headline:
Lady Astor's Old Seat Goes Labour.

* * *

● A woman on a collective farm in Siberia, who has just celebrated her 117th birthday, refuses to be pensioned off, saying that she has worked all her life and would feel worse with nothing to do. Her son, aged 90, works on the farm with her.
—*Reuter Dispatch*

Are there no child labor laws in the promised land?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SHALL WE RETAIN T

YES!

By Alice R. Craemer

A direct descendent of the Emperor Jimmu, founder in 660 B.C. of Japan and great-great-grandson of the sun goddess, Amaterasu, Emperor Hirohito is now supreme ruler in Japan—supreme Japanese ruler—by the grace of God and the Allied surrender terms.

Ever since the obscure days of the late 12th century, the Emperor of Japan has been a tool in the hands of power-hungry politicians. At that time an ambitious war lord established his supremacy over the country and forced the Emperor into the background. From that time until the end of the 19th century, a stretch of 700 years, the Emperor reigned only as the spiritual head of Japan. Only once, and for a very few years, did an Emperor (Go-Daigo) restore the Imperial authority during this whole time. Instead Japan was ruled by a long line of powerful ministers, who as Shoguns, held absolute authority over all the military forces of the empire and who, as individuals, usurped any other power necessary to meet their ends. It was these Shoguns who, fearing the infiltration of foreign religious and commercial interests, closed Japan to the outside world. This was in the middle of the 17th century. For 200 years thereafter the Japanese were forbidden to go abroad for any reason whatsoever and normal intercourse with other nations was severed.

Other political forces gradually made themselves known and by the middle of the 19th century contested the rule of the Shoguns. These clan leaders saw an opportunity in the restoration of the Emperor to gain power for themselves and to overthrow the domination of the feudal leaders. Their ally was the Emperor himself, man and institution. Consequently on January 3, 1868, fifteen years after Commodore Perry had forced his way into the Bay of Yedo, the Emperor Meiji threw off his role as puppet. And with Meiji's emergence, the modernization of Japan began.

The clan leaders, or "advisors," first set out to establish the Emperor firmly as the head of the nation. His person was moved from the holy city of Kyoto to Yedo (now Tokyo), seat of Shogunate power. Shintoism, "the way of the gods," an indigenous Japanese religion, was revived and refurbished to make the Emperor synonymous with the State. A constitution, written in 1888 by Prince Ito under German inspiration,

(Continued on page 146)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JAPANESE EMPEROR?

NO!

By Mary Katharine Strong

The United Nations have won the war and made the first important steps in winning the peace in Europe. In Asia, we have won the war and made the first important steps in losing the peace. This is tantamount to losing the war, for as President Truman cogently expressed it:

> "Victory in a great war is not something you win once and for all, like victory in a ball game. Victory in a great war is something that must be won and kept won. It can be lost after you have won it—if you are careless, or negligent or indifferent."

We won victory on the Pacific battlefield; we are losing it in the political arena. The momentous decision to keep the Emperor as the titular head of Japan shows how completely the Western world has been fooled by the "Emperor Hoax."

For it is a hoax. Even the most casual reading of Japanese history shows that the Japanese Emperor is, in the words of Owen Lattimore, the "sacred cow No. I, and in fact the cow to end all cows." Japanese history is reputed to extend back to 660 B.C. Yet it was not until after Commodore Perry knocked on the door of isolated Japan that the Emperor became an important factor in Nipponese politics. He reigned but did not rule. The nation's power was in the hands of the Shogunate, a peculiar institution of centralized feudalism. The Shoguns, like the Emperor, held their dictatorial powers by hereditary right. They were the link between the people and the Emperor.

Ancient Japanese history is the story of one feudal lord fighting another for the prize stake: control of the Emperor and rule of Japan. In 1185 one of these ambitious warlords established his supremacy over his opponents and became Shogun, or generalissimo. The subsequent seven centuries saw the Emperor nothing more than a figurehead. The real power was wielded by the feudal warriors. The only actual authority given the Mikado was that of appointing the Shogun leader who would be his virtual jailor. Even the area of this choice was minutely circumscribed, as only members of one family were eligible. There was the interesting spectacle of making mere children emperors so that the regent, from the ruling clan, could have absolute power. The Japanese did not treat their Emperor as a God, though lip service was given to this myth. Emperors who did not suit them were forced off the throne,

(Continued on page 150)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from page 144)

established the throne as the source of power and the oligarchy as the exercisers of it. "The Empire of Japan shall be reigned over and governed by a line of Emperors unbroken for ages eternal" (Article I); "the Emperor is sacred and inviolable" (Article III); "All the different legislative as well as executive powers of the state, by means of which He reigns over the country and governs the people, are united in the Most Exalted Personage, who holds in His hands, as it were, all the ramifying threads of the political life of the country." The Emperor has supreme command of the Army and Navy, declares wars, makes peace and concludes all foreign treaties. But the imperial advisors remained in direct contact with the throne and thus in reality could keep the power themselves. The men who instigated this system were the Genro, the elder statesmen, the last of whom died only a few years ago. Those who have carried it on since have been the military and industrialists, each vying for power but each at least partially dependent upon the other.

THE INSTITUTION

The seventy-seven years since the restoration have seen the Emperor firmly instilled in the Japanese way of life. He is the divine source of all temporal power; he is the reason for existing and for dying; it is for him the Japanese sought to conquer the world; and it was for him they died in the losing battles against the Allies. He is the be-all and the end-all of their existence. The energy, the loyalty, the morality of the Japanese center in the Emperor as a spiritual institution. His signature was used to join the Rome-Berlin axis, to withdraw from the League of Nations, to declare war on the United States, to surrender Japan to the Allies. When the Emperor passes down the street, all the shades in the upper story windows must be drawn lest anyone look down on him. The name of the Emperor has more weight in Japan than the will of the people has in America.

THE MAN

Hirohito, himself, is of little significance. Educated along the lines of the modern Japanese militarist, he came to the throne on Christmas Day, 1926. It was said that, before Pearl Harbor, any expert on marine zoology could easily get an audience with him. On the whole he has no connection with the formulation of Japan's actual policies.

Such is the Japanese Emperor. Such is the institution and the man that the Allies have thus far chosen to preserve. His role as a puppet, however, remains unchanged. Control is no longer in the hands of the Japanese militarists or the Japanese industrialists, but in the hands of an American, one greatly responsible for Japan's defeat.

The question of the Japanese Emperor almost prolonged the war, just

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

how long no one dared venture. In the ultimatum issued by the United States, Great Britain and China on July 26, no specific mention was made of the Emperor. The ultimatim was rejected. On August 10, Japan offered to surrender in accordance with the Potsdam declaration "with the understanding that the said declaration does not comprise any demand which prejudices the prerogatives of his majesty as a sovereign ruler." The following day the Allies accepted the Japanese offer with the stipulation that the Emperor be under the direct authority of the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers. Then the world waited for three long days before the Japanese acceptance was announced. During these long days of waiting, the controversy over the Japanese Emperor, whether or not he should be retained, became widespread. We wondered whether it was some sort of trick, whether the militarists behind Hirohito had some treacherous plan, whether the Emperor really would carry out our orders. Some cried that the surrender had all the earmarks of a negotiated peace. But others thought the Allied authorities had been wise in accepting the opportunities offered by the surrender and doing as they did.

EMPEROR RETAINED

The Allies are indeed justified in their decision to retain the Emperor as the titular head of Japan. As well as expediency, there are other reasons supporting their action: (1) the Emperor is a channel through which the Allies brought about the final details of surrender; (2) his presence provides the necessary stability and order for the Allied rule of Japan; (3) his actual rule would mean a political revolution in Japan; and (4) his full disposition is better left up to the Japanese people themselves.

As the recognized head of Japan, although powerless, the Emperor commands the allegiance of all Japanese people, soldier and civilian alike. All military action, all political decrees, all things of national importance are done in his name whether or not initiated by him. His name gives the necessary legality to all surrender measures. Without an Imperial Rescript, the war might not have ended without further bloodshed. Patriotic soldiers on far flung fronts would have thought that their Emperor had been betrayed and that it was their duty to fight to the bitter end. But with the endorsement of their Emperor, they realized that the order to lay down their arms meant just that. In the Imperial Rescript of August 14, Hirohito warned his people against any undue demonstrations: "Beware most strictly of any outbursts of emotion that may engender needless complications, of any fraternal contention and strife that may create confusion, lead you astray and cause you to lose the confidence of the world. . . . Let the entire nation continue as one family . . . mindful of its heavy burden of responsibilities, and the long road before it." Members of the Imperial family were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dispatched to the various war fronts to enforce the laying down of arms and to represent the Emperor. The Emperor read a second rescript before the opening session of the Imperial Diet on September 4: "It is our desire that our people will . . . win the confidence of the world, establish firmly a peaceful state and contribute to the progress of mankind . . . In consummation of the great task, yet would we remain cool, calm, . . . observe faithfully commitments of the empire and foster accord and amity with all nations." While the Emperor's action may seem slow to some people, he is gradually shaping the collective Japanese mind into a workable state. After all, it was not many months ago that they were continually being convinced of the pending Japanese victory!

In Europe we have had the experience of wiping out an enemy government and then having no one with whom to deal. Confusion, chaos, pockets of enemy resistance were the only answer. Fortunately, so far we have been spared this in Japan.

EXECUTION OF ORDERS

Besides seeing to it that Japan's land, sea and air forces actually laid down their arms, the Emperor is responsible for carrying out the other terms of surrender. Since he appoints all members of the government and can dismiss them, the Emperor can have the utmost cooperation in the completion of his tasks. The present government of Japan, headed by Premier (General, Prince) Narihiko Higashi-Kuni, uncle of the Empress, is considered a "surrender" government and according to Ernest K. Lindley, has been "selected with a view to obtaining compliance by the Japanese military with the Emperor's surrender decrees." Cooperation with him would seem to extend beyond the circle of government officials. The Emperor has always had great influence, although rarely political, over the masses. Not all the educated Japanese accept the Emperor's divinity, but most of them accept the "Emperor principle"—State Shintoism. Responsibility with a capital "R" lodges in him. If the Emperor, with all the prestige he commands, were to be deposed, the Japanese would make a martyr of him. Is a discredited god not better than a martyred one? To quote *The Washington Post*, "We cannot go around knocking off deities." Moreover, if we were to get rid of the Emperor, the Japanese reactionaries and militarists would have a tangible symbol for future restoration plots, similar to their exploits of the 1860's.

We are not forced to repeat one blunder of the last war. In 1918 peace was negotiated with the group of Germans who did not start the war. Consequently it was easy for Hitler to enlarge upon the "stab in the back" theme, a very effective one as history proved. In Japan we are dealing with the man who at least in name is responsible for Japanese aggression, with a man who is being made humble and who will

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lose the rest of his "face" in the eyes of his subjects. During the war years, Japan heard the voice of Hirohito, but the words were those of the militarists. Now, as *The Detroit Free Press* puts it, "the voice will still be the voice of Hirohito, but the hand will be the hand of their master." The Japanese at every turn will be reminded of their defeat. What crafty politician can cover up the physical presence of troops in the armies of occupation or the new "advisors" by their Emperor's side? Or what enthusiastic industrialist can hide the fact that the whole economy of the country will be geared to a different goal? It is not as if we, recognizing in the Emperor the government of Japan, shall turn our backs and take for granted that all will go according to plan. On the contrary. We shall be able to take advantage of an established frame and substitute a new picture. For as Dorothy Thompson comments, "To dispossess the Emperor is one thing; to replace him with something else is another."

POLITICAL REVOLUTION

We are told that a political revolution would improve the situation in Japan from an occupational point of view. The direct rule of the Emperor would actually be such a revolution. No time in history has the Emperor been free from the domination or influence of a powerful individual or political group. The effect of the present arrangement would be the destruction of the social and political structure of Japan which has been in existence since 1868. The oligarchy, represented by former Premier Suzuki, sought in the retention of the Emperor to insure the continuation of this system. Only in that way would they be at all able to keep any of their power and wealth. But their "success" will be short-lived. Many of these influential people will be executed as war criminals. Further, it is questionable that any system such as this can survive the humility of foreign rule and having to submit so openly. Instead of perpetuating Japanese militarism, they will contribute to its liquidation. The war party has been destroyed by surrender itself. We shall have in Japan the Emperor and the people with nothing between them. The treacherous elements will be obliterated. Into this gap after a while will come new elements, new influences designed to cooperate with the Allies and interested in the reconstruction of Japan on a peaceful basis. Never before has the Emperor been the actual ruler in Japan.

What will eventually happen to the Emperor is only speculation. It is hoped that the people of Japan will become democratized enough to get rid of him themselves, for he can survive only if they continue to want him. As a precedent we have the example of Turkey after the last war. The Treaty of Sevres, ending the war against Turkey, was negotiated with the Sultan-Caliph (high priest). Although no Allied arrangements were made insisting upon a revolution, the Turks them-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selves threw out the Sultan-Caliph and completely modernized and renovated Turkey. A new treaty, the Treaty of Lausanne, was negotiated with the new government. And this treaty, incidently, withstood the test of time better than any other peace treaty afer World War I. It would undoubtedly be asking too much to hope that Japan would, for some remote reason, follow in Turkey's path. But it would seem best to let the fate of the Japanese Emperor rest in the hands of the Japanese people and the play of internal political forces in Japan.

For the present, the Emperor should remain as he is, head of the Japanese state . . . in name only. Until such time as a peaceful Japan is running smoothly and the Japanese choose to discard him, the Emperor can be and is useful to the Allied authorities as a royal administrator, transmitting our orders to the Japanese people. If for any reason, the Emperor should not prove trustworthy in carrying out his tasks or should be incapable of maintaining order in the country, the Allies will still be in a position to depose him. For the time being, let him serve us.

(Continued from page 145)

compelled to take the tonsure, sent into exile or forced to commit suicide. In one instance the Mikado was assassinated. Similar action was taken with troublesome crown princes.

The momentous turning point in Japanese history occurred in 1868. There was dissatisfaction over the fact that Japan had been opened up to the "foreign devils," and the "outs," capitalizing on popular feeling, overthrew the ruling Shogun and conquered the country under the guise of saving Japan from foreigners. The important factor in the revolution was the use made of the Emperor. He was taken out of his innocucus position, dusted off and made the focus of a new type of loyalty—the new national loyalty combined with that of the old feudal system. There had always been in Japan an indigenous nebulous religion called Shinto. With remarkable cleverness the new leaders around the Emperor turned Shinto into a political cult which utilized all the facets of sacred but half-forgotten myths and symbols and rituals to build up a nation united by loyalty to their Emperor.

This made it possible for the key men of the former ruling class to evade their feudal responsibility to the Shogun on the pretense of a higher loyalty to the Emperor. The mass of the population quickly regrouped around the Emperor on the appeal of unity in the face of the foreigner. It was Shinto that fused Emperor-worship with fanatical nationalism. It was Shinto which has so identified the Emperor with Japan's history of conquest and savagery that we can never hope to see a democratic Japan while he remains.

It is not coincidence that the Emperor of Japan is one of the richest men in the world, with personal economic interests in the major indus-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tries of Japan. The new leaders saw that without trade and industry they could never match the Western powers. Increased trade meant greater wealth and power in the hands of those engaged in trade. The usual clash between commercial interests and feudal traditions was avoided because the "insiders" of the feudal group went into trade. The old class remained supreme, but what it did with its power helped industry. Thus the new economic interests, instead of competing with the old system, became intertwined with them. The Emperor's loyalty to the new pattern of power was assured by the simple expedient of letting him "in on the ground floor" by the investment of "imperial household" funds in the new enterprises. The Mikado in this way combined the ideological foundation of the feudal system with a main piller of vested interests in the budding capitalistic structure.

GREAT INCONSISTENCIES

There is a great inconsistency in the arguments of those desiring to retain the Emperor. It is asserted on the one hand that he is really nothing but a figurehead and so not responsible for Japan's decade of conquest. On the other hand, it is argued that since he has the complete obedience of the Japanese people, he can make our occupation a great deal easier. Both of these theories cannot be true. At any other time this double-talk might be comical; it can be tragic today, especially since either horn of the dilemma points to disastrous conclusions.

Let us assume that the Emperor has been but a figurehead. This view can be somewhat substantiated by recent Japanese history. The 1868 Constitution declares him to be omnipotent. He is "sacred and inviolable." He is supreme commander of the armed forces, declares war and concludes treaties. He sanctions laws and orders them promulgated. His ministers are responsible only to him. Actually, however, his position has altered little from the days of his forebears. He is now a great symbol to the people, Shinto is the national cult, but he has become the mouthpiece of various groups—capitalists, bureaucrats, politicians and the military. Leaders even rationalize disobedience to imperial rescripts by saying that the Emperor's mind has been "polluted" by his advisers. With this precedent, the idea of MacArthur pollution will no doubt become very popular. In any event, the main reason for keeping the Emperor has been dissolved. If he is but a figurehead, he cannot control the fanatical hotheads, the Army leaders thirsting for revenge. As for the mass of workers and peasants, their history of submissiveness to unbearable hardships gives no indication that the worm, after all these centuries, will turn.

If the Emperor is nothing but a figurehead, it is indeed strange that the Japanese now make such a point of him. The best explanation is that the Emperor is making a point of the Emperor. Here is a long awaited chance to throw off his domination by various groups. Here is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his chance to retain his industrial and landed wealth, now that Allied bombing is a thing of the past. And he has the entire backing of the American Army to secure his position. Proof of this design can be seen in the fact that the new premier is at one and the same time Hirohito's cousin, his uncle and his in-law. All major decisions and governmental actions concerning Japanese surrender have been taken, not, as was customary before, in the name of any Japanese government acting under imperial sanction, but directly in the name of the Emperor himself. Members of the royal family were dispatched to the fronts to see that the Emperor's orders were obeyed. Such lifting of wartime restrictions as did occur, to "make the people happier," were undertaken by direct command from the Emperor.

Never before has a Japanese Emperor assumed so much direct power. The first effects of the surrender seem to be a strengthening of the Emperor's autocracy.

Even should it be finally proven that the Emperor has been only somebody's Charlie McCarthy, as a puppet he has assumed certain characteristics. He is the keystone of the entire Japanese religious, economic, political and social structure. He is the symbol of Japanese expansion. Every word and act of his has publicly supported the worst that Japan has done, and has cloaked its aggression with religious sanctions. To attack the big business interests without attacking the richest man in the country, who stood to profit the most from a successful war or a negotiated peace, is more than foolishly inconsistent. To attack the military without attacking its titular commander, is like attacking the Prussian generals but sparing Hitler. We are in effect saying to the Japanese people that their feudal idea of Emperor worship has our approval, that we agree with them that regardless of the mistakes individuals make, the grandiose schemes of the Imperial Mind ruling Japan remain above censure even by the enemy.

HELPED JAPANESE AGGRESSION

There is plenty of evidence, however, that the Emperor was more than a passive operator during the last ten years. In this case, he stands fairly close to the top of the War Criminals list. He made no move to incorporate the Army and Navy heads into the Cabinet, where they could be controlled more easily, though he had the authority to do so. It was he who personally went to the Diet in 1941 to urge it to abdicate its functions to the War Cabinet. Even in the presence of the Son of Heaven, it took hours of argument to make the Diet give in. When he spoke to the Japanese people on August 15, he confirmed responsibility for declaring war on the United States.

As the fortunes of war turned slowly against the Japanese, a change appeared in the Tokyo propaganda line. The people were told that this was a struggle which would last for 100 years, and though Japan might

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lose the first round, the Western powers would soon become careless and tired, and then time would once again be auspicious for Japan to settle unfinished business. Well, Japan has lost the first round. One has a nervous feeling that perhaps the Japanese were correct. It would appear that we weakened, that "unconditional surrender" was so modified that the symbol of Japanese nationalism, feudalism and aggression remains untarnished in the eyes of the people.

Any doubts concerning the Emperor's sympathies are removed by reading Hirohito's Rescript announcing surrender. It is impossible to tell from this masterpiece of duplicity that Japan lost the war. No sooner had Japan agreed to surrender than the Emperor took to the radio speaking falsehoods. He declared that when the United States and Britain were attacked, there was no thought "either to infringe upon the sovereignty of other nations or to embark upon territorial aggrandizement." He attributed Japan's defeat to "a new and most cruel bomb," and because of his love for humanity, agreed to stop fighting before we saw "the total extinction of human civilization."

NO WAR GUILT

So in order to let the Japanese "save face," there is no mention of war guilt, no mention of the numerous defeats suffered by the Nipponese Armies, defeats about which the people know nothing. The whole tone of the speech was that Japan gambled, and had almost won the gamble when the atom bombs were dropped, at which point the Emperor, loving humanity, decided to call the whole thing off. It is now established that long before the Japanese knew of the atomic bomb, they were trying to sue for peace through Russia. The Japanese Emperor did not inform the people that he is now obligated to take orders from the Allied Supreme Commander. A prize bit of understatement was found in the Emperor's speech. It was the only intimation that Japan was licked: "The war situation has developed not necessarily to Japan's advantage." It is ominous that he re-assured the people that he had been "able to save . . . and maintain the structure of the Imperial State."

On the heels of this came the statement of the chief of the overseas bureau of the Japanese Broadcasting Corporation. To the troops on the fighting front he declared: "We have lost, but this is only temporary." Field Marshal Prince Nashimoto broadcast that a nation like America "relying on material might and without fearing the power in heaven . . . is never the final victor." Strange talk from the defeated people, but even more disturbing is another part of the same speech: "Guard and maintain the prosperity of the Imperial Throne . . . and . . . ultimately destroy the strong enemy and consumate the purpose of this holy war."

Those who believe that history has its lessons for the present should be concerned about our attitude toward Japan. We can see the mak-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ings of a myth; we can see the story of 1919 Germany re-enacted before our eyes. When von Ludendorff and von Hindenburg advised the Kaiser that defeat was inevitable and that it was necessary to sue for peace, Germany had not been invaded. Its army retired in good order and was demobilized. Hitler was clever enough to propagandize the belief that the Reichswehr had not been beaten but was stabbed in the back by the home front. Our occupation was vague and indifferent. The pressure to get the troops back home was too strong to be withstood.

Today, we have a Japanese army of 2,500,000 to demobilize. This army has never been defeated. The American forces have never met the main enemy army in battle. But a Hitler does not need to come down from the hills to take up the cause. We have retained the Japanese national Emperor-legend and their faith in their system. The Emperor does not admit defeat, he has voluntarily granted peace because of divine solicitude for his people.

The Tokyo radio warned that "hotheads" may cause trouble for our forces of occupation. This indicates that the war lords, like the Germans in the last conflict, have not accepted defeat, that there is still a psychology of war in Japan.

In this country the 1919 picture is repeating itself. A strong movement is underway to "get the boys back home." With the 1946 Congressional elections coming up, with Congressmen already assailing President Truman's continuation of the draft, our chances in Japan do not look too hopeful. And when we pull out, nothing will have been done to establish a firm foundation for democracy; the Emperor will remain, stronger than ever.

THERE IS AN ALTERNATIVE

We have decided to retain the Emperor. What was our alternative? Informed observers feel that we did have a choice. China, who undoubtedly understands Japanese psychology better than any other nation, has been vigorous in its denunciation of the Emperor. Apparently Japan's nearest neighbor does not fear internal disorders as much as does the distant United States. Sun Fo, son of Sun Yat Sen, feels that Hirohito is, in the eyes of the Japanese people, the "leader-warrior," and to keep him is to sanction his role. In a recent article Sun Fo says: "A Japan which retained the Mikado and the system of emperor-worship would be comparable to a Germany which was allowed to retain the Fuehrer and the substance of Nazism . . . The proposal to save the Mikado is simply a signal to prepare for another conflagration." Such Far Eastern experts as Admiral Yarnell and General Chennault agree with the foolhardiness of retaining Hirohito.

It has been fashionable of late to underestimate the liberal movement in Japan. Japanese history, however, shows that the people readily

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

understand ideas alien to their culture. When the Japanese, in the sixteenth century, were living in a world of purely oriental thought, Christianity spread rapidly among them. When the ruling Shogun a century later decide to stamp out the movement, there was a long bloody battle, ending with the last ditch hopeless stand of 37,000 Christians, all of whom were killed. The rapidity with which Japan adopted Western materialism and fashions shows what can be done in the way of Western thought. When the governmental policy is oriented in the direction of the introduction of political parties, trade unions, unfettered newspapers and in general a program similar to that carried on now in Germany, equal adaptability will be seen.

In modern times the liberals have exercised some influence. In the 1936 elections the liberals gained seats in the Diet, while the war party lost. The expansionists, however, refused to accept the verdict of the ballot boxes, and there followed a wave of assassinations which liquidated the important members of the liberal cabinet. The Army enhanced its power, and the next year saw the start of Japanese aggression in China.

The drives against "dangerous thoughts" show that some liberalism is to be found among the people. During the past two decades many hundreds of teachers and students have been thrown in prison because of the ideas they expressed. It is estimated that 60,000 people were arrested after 1925 on charges of expressing thoughts dangerous to the national welfare.

There is thus a nucleus around which our occupation army can build. Granted, the task will not be easy and we may have to put up with revolts by fanatical army men. But these same army men, long accustomed to manipulating the Emperor, will not refrain from revolt merely because the Emperor speaks for the Allied Supreme Command. We have just started to fight to make Japan a member of the family of nations; let us not abdicate because the task seems difficult.

The Japanese have a love of novelty and change. Note their enthusiastic reception of Confucianism, Buddhism and finally Westernism. It may be that the energies which transformed Japanese economic life during the restoration can be set to transforming Japanese political life now that the war is over. Furthermore, few things impress the Japanese more than success. The Japanese Constitution was constructed on Prussian lines in part because Germany had just finished the victorious Franco-Prussian War. And there should be no doubt as to who won World War II.

Aggression has its foundations not only in trade and politics but in the Japanese mind and institutional structure. The Emperor is the keystone of a dangerous social edifice. Those who favor his retention talk of using him to establish democracy by imperial command. This is indeed a mockery on the meaning of democracy. While the Emperor remains, the shackled national mind cannot free itself of repressions or move toward mature participation in world affairs.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DOCUMENTS

Imperial Rescript Announcing Japanese Surrender, August 14:

To our good and loyal subjects:

After pondering deeply the general trends of the world and the actual conditions obtaining in our empire today, we have decided to effect a settlement of the present situation by resorting to an extraordinary measure.

We have ordered our government to communicate to the governments of the United States, Great Britain, China and the Soviet Union that our empire accepts the provisions of their joint declaration.

To strive for the common prosperity and happiness of all nations as well as the security and well-being of our subjects is the solemn obligation which has been handed down by our imperial ancestors and which we lay close to the heart.

Indeed, we declared war on America and Britain out of our sincere desire to insure Japan's self-preservation and the stabilization of East Asia, it being far from our thought either to infringe upon the sovereignty of other nations or to embark upon territorial aggrandizement.

But now the war has lasted for nearly four years. Despite the best that has been done by every one—the gallant fighting of the military and naval forces, the diligence and assiduity of our servants of the State and the devoted service of our 100,000,000 people—the war situation has developed not necessarily to Japan's advantage, while the general trends of the world have all turned against her interest.

Moreover, the enemy has begun to employ a new and most cruel bomb, the power of which to do damage is, indeed, incalculable, taking the toll of many innocent lives. Should we continue to fight, it would not only result in an ultimate collapse and obliteration of the Japanese nation, but also it would lead to the total extinction of human civilization.

Such being the case, how are we to save the millions of our subjects, or to atone ourselves before the hallowed spirits of our imperial ancestors? This is the reason why we have ordered the acceptance of the provisions of the joint declaration of the powers.

We cannot but express the deepest sense of regret to our allied nations of East Asia, who have consistently cooperated with the Emperor towards the emancipation of East Asia.

The thought of those officers and men as well as others who have fallen in the fields of battle, those who died at their posts of duty, or those who met with death (otherwise) and all their bereaved families, pains our heart night and day.

The welfare of the wounded and the war sufferers and of those who have lost their home and livelihood is the object of our profound solicitude. The hardships and sufferings to which our nation is to be subjected thereafter will be certainly great.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We are keenly aware of the inmost feelings of all of you, our subjects. However, it is according to the dictates of time and fate that we have resolved to pave the way for a grand peace for all the generations to come by enduring the (unavoidable) and suffering what is unsufferable. Having been able to save . . . and maintain the structure of the Imperial state, we are always with you, our good and loyal subjects, relying upon your sincerity and integrity.

Beware most strictly of any outbursts of emotion that may engender needless complications, of any fraternal contention and strife that may create confusion, lead you astray and cause you to lose the confidence of the world.

Let the entire nation continue as one family from generation to generation, ever firm in its faith of the imperishableness of its divine land, and mindful of its heavy burden of responsibilities, and the long road before it. Unite your total strength to be devoted to the construction for the future. Cultivate the ways of rectitude, nobility of spirit, and work with resolution so that you may enhance the innate glory of the imperial state and keep pace with the progress of the world.

REFERENCES:

Books:

Allen, G. C., *Modern Japan and Its Problems*
Grew, J. C., *Ten Years in Japan*
McGovern, W. M., *Modern Japan*
Murdock, J. A., *A History of Japan*
Steiger, G. Nye, *History of the Far East*
Steiner, J. F., *Behind the Japanese Mask*
Young, A. M., *Japan in Recent Times*

Periodicals:

"Japan," *Fortune, April,* 1944
"The Sacred Cow of Japan," Owen Lattimore, *The (South African) Forum,* July 14, 1945
Bisson, T. A., "What Program for Japan?", *The Nation,* July 14, 1945
Salisbury, L. E., "The Zaibatsu," *The Nation,* July 14, 1945
Stone, I. F., "Pearl Harbor Diplomats," *The Nation,* July 14, 1945

* * *

● The city slicker fascinated by the sight of an old man sacking eggs in a grocery store, asked, "Do you know how many eggs in a dozen?" The worker allowed as how he didn't. "Then how do you know how many you're putting in the sack?" Replied the old man: "I can count up to nine, and then I just add three more eggs."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Can German Youth Be Saved?

By Louis Clair

From an article in The Progressive

A FEW months ago, the Swiss press reported the following incident:

"Among the many refugees recently arriving here, there was a 12-year old boy from near Bayreuth (Northeast Bavaria). He declared that he had been a member of the Hitler Youth against his will and that he never liked the service. In February he planned to escape. He made a sketch from a European map of his camp and then ran away without telling anybody of his plan. The trip took him six weeks, staying in villages, helping farmers in the fields, until he finally reached the Swiss frontier."

The United Press reported from Kassel (May 8):

"Two 17-year old German boys who flirted with death by aiding the Allies, proudly told today of the '*Edelweiss* pirates.' The *Edelweiss* gang, a loosely knit network of teen-age lads, banded together to sabotage the Nazis in every way possible—destroying material and beating up party members.

"They wore a gaudy 5-and-10-cent-store flower pin underneath their left lapel as their only identification. . . .

"The *Edelweiss* organization apparently is an almost leaderless nationwide gang that took its name from the Alpine flower. Members are usually children of working-class parents. . . .

" 'We hated the Hitler Youths. When they started parading around, giving orders and beating up people, we wanted to show them we weren't taking their orders,' said Heinz Johannes. 'The Nazis made us work from 10 to 12 hours daily and after that we were supposed to work for the party; we didn't even have time to sleep,' said baby-faced Hermann Bannenberg."

Shortly before the final downfall of his bloody reign, Heinrich Himmler, head of the Gestapo, took time out to draw up personally a circular letter to all Gestapo units on anti-Nazi activities by youth groups:

"In all parts of the Reich, particularly in big cities, the formation of youth groups is on the increase. These groups have oppositional political as well as liberal individualistic tendencies. They lead a life incompatible with National Socialist ideas. The groups consist of young men and sometimes girls. . . .

"A number of their leaders come from former opposition groups or student organizations.

© 1945, by The Progressive, Madison, Wisconsin

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . Parents often encourage their children to join such groups. Their opposition is shown by indifference to war events, evasion of service, assaults on members of the Hitler Youth, listening to foreign broadcasts, spreading of rumors and carrying on the tradition of illegal groups."

In the middle of 1944 the *Deutsche Polizei,* organ of the German police, explained why it had been found necessary to institute special "police camps for the protection of juveniles":

"There is an inclination among juveniles to form cliques whose members soon indulge in an accentuated indifference and indolent attitude to contemporary events. They very soon become opposed to the Hitler Youth, in certain instances even to National Socialist philosophy, and finally aim at committing punishable acts."

I hope these lengthy quotations didn't bore you. I must confess that, when I first came across these and similar reports, I was tremendously excited. For years we had heard about the depravation of everything German, but especially about the total Nazification of the entire German youth. Maybe we felt that something was wrong about these statements, that even the most total control of all phases of human life, even indoctrination and propaganda from cradle to grave, could not completely extinguish spontaneous human reactions. But we hardly had anything to point to.

And then there came this curious report from a prisoners' camp in North Africa (*The New York Times,* June 7, 1943):

"Thousands of the prisoners are youths of 16, 17, 18. They didn't share the idolatry of Adolph Hitler common among men 10 or 12 years older. . . . The Hitler Youth to which most of them belonged had not succeded in giving them any great love of war. . . . "

Well, this contradicted all we had heard so far. These youngsters had been reared under Nazism, they were supposed to be completely poisoned, without hope of salvation; and here just they, contrary to the generation immediately preceding them, were said to be sharply critical of Hitler and the war.

And then reports began to come in from various sides: The leaders of the Hitler Youth were seriously concerned about the weakening of their hold on young people. . . . Hitler Youth patrols kept a special eye on unorganized tramping and hiking and the formation of youth gangs. . . . In Krefeld at least 30 per cent of the Hitler Youth were secret *Edelweiss* members. . . . They are romantic and confused, idealistic and militant . . . they want to destroy the Nazi state and they dream of some kind of new world which they cannot describe more concretely than by saying it should be free. . . . They don't know a thing about democracy, cannot define it, don't know what it is but they will all tell you that they want some kind of liberty. . . . They made life miserable for leaders and mem-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bers of the Hitler Youth. One of their practices was to waylay young Nazis and beat them up.... Their chief aim was to destroy the Hitler Youth which they found dull and corrupt....

What does it all add up to? The theoreticians, who concluded from their desks here that Nazi indoctrination has completely got hold of the German youth, have shown that, more than the Nazi youth, they themselves have fallen victim to Nazi propaganda.

The Nazis fondly believed that it was possible to remake completely the human mind through indoctrination; they believed that there is nothing inherently spontaneous in the make-up of human psychology, nothing that cannot be remodeled by modern soul doctoring, just as modern surgery remodels parts of the human body.

They completely overlooked the fact that Nazi propaganda had been successful at a time when insecure and revolted youth craved for some sort of leadership in the midst of insecurity, frustration, and unemployment. But for the younger generation, the Hitler Youth no longer was the romantic movement it had been for their elders; it rather represented the society of the grownups; it was an official institution just like school.

No amount of indoctrination could reconcile these youngsters with the huge bureaucratic machinery that the Hitler Youth had become. Said one of them: "Who the hell wants to spend all his time marching, drilling and doing service."

That's no life! These kids had the vaguest notions of what "life" could be, they didn't know a thing about pre-Nazi or foreign political conditions. One of them said to a startled interviewer, pointing to a friend of his, that "he was a dependable reactionary." Only after a while did the interviewer realize that because the Nazis in their propaganda speeches often attacked 'reactionaries,' the boy simply had adopted this terminology, giving it a positive instead of a negative content.

These youngsters revolted against indoctrination and drilling. They vaguely sensed the emptiness of Nazi life and craved for different values, for a release of energies which could find no outlet within the garrison state. No doubt, *Edelweiss* and the various other opposition youth movements with the romantic names didn't have a concrete political program; theirs was just revolt, just striving for something else, something freer, something where young people could freely associate and thrash out their ideas. Nevertheless, what a defeat for the Nazi education program!

The Nazi regime has collapsed, but the spirit of Hitler blossoms among Americans, columnists, educators, publicists. They still proclaim that the Nazis have completely poisoned German youth, that all youngsters born and reared under the Nazis are a lost generation. They, just as Nazi educators, cannot understand that the human mind is not simply a machine to absorb and reproduce ster-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eotyped thinking, and thus they advocate that swarms of American educators descend on German schools and universities to re-educate (read re-indoctrinate) German youth. But these new re-educators would meet with as little success as the Nazis did. Free man can be born only in a free society; compulsory re-education breeds resistance and not understanding of democratic ideas.

The Nazis have caused tremendous ravages among the younger generation of Germany, no doubt. Some of these youth did revolt, but their revolt had little concrete content; their opposition was almost entirely negative. But a new society needs positive aims, and ideals that go beyond mere rejection. These ideals, however, cannot be imposed from the outside.

An excellent report on German opposition youth movements, issued by the American Association for a Democratic Germany (New York City) states:

"The best elements of the young generation will have kept youthful enthusiasm and longing for positive goals that can be transformed into positive action and a positive ideology. You can put these young people to hard work . . . if at the same time you can fill them with the vision of a new Europe in whose rebuilding they participate and of which they will be a part. . . .

"On the other hand, you can let them do exactly the same kind of work, but declare it a punitive measure by which the German youth — the pariahs of Europe — are being punished for the sins of their fathers and older brothers, and you will repel and disillusion them a second time."

It is the second method that is now being followed. These youth groups were hounded by the Gestapo. They are now hounded by military police, since, as political organizations, they are strictly forbidden in Western Germany. German youth, just as German adults, now live on a starvation diet of around 1,000 calories. What the winter will bring is hard to imagine. All schools and universities are closed, normal social life is nearly at a standstill.

Two years ago, a Nazi professor wrote an alarmed article on German university students:

"They are tired of the political conception of life and are seeking private intellectual satisfaction. . . . It makes me shudder to think that they will some day hold responsible positions."

These students are the men who can assume the burden of education in a new Germany; they only, and not the products of Military Government's accelerated teaching courses. As a recent manifesto of German Socialists from Buchenwald concentration camp (which had been completely suppressed in the American press and has only been published now) says: "No one can re-educate us but ourselves, who must assume this task in freedom."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Occupation of Japan

By Sidney Shalett

From his column in The New York Times

A PERIOD of stern but just rule under General Douglas MacArthur's firm hands is in store for Japan. Yet it is believed here that in many respects, our problems in Japan are more complex than in Germany, and that, unless we know exactly what we intend to do and carry out our intentions precisely, our occupation responsibilities may be longer and more difficult than we anticipate.

It is a big job that General of the Army MacArthur, the Allied Supreme Commander in the Pacific, the man who will rule Japan's "Son of Heaven," faces. The commander's qualifications, in the opinion of many observers here, are excellent.

He knows the Japanese people, as well as the other peoples of the Far East, well; he is a strong and austere man, a proved administrator and one with enormous personal prestige in the Far East, even among the defeated enemy.

The sober and realistic spirit in which the United States is approaching the job of ruling Japan was reflected recently in statements from high military leaders.

Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, in warning that we will have to keep a large army in the Far East for some time, declared that until we had determined that "no new treachery is being planned" by any Japanese groups, we must have the means "to stamp out inexorably and completely any uprising."

The size of the occupation forces still is a closely guarded military secret, but there are indications that it will be sizable.

Mr. Stimson estimated that the Japanese had 2,250,000 trained and armed soldiers in the home islands alone, and an equal number on the mainland and throughout the Pacific. At the present time, we have approximately 1,800,000 troops in the Pacific theater and Far East.

These troops, coupled with the manpower of the Russians and the Chinese in Manchuria and China, and the British, Indian, Australian, and New Zealand troops in Southeast Asia and the Southwest Pacific, are certainly adequate to do the job of disarming the Japanese and henceforth keeping order in the Orient.

Our job is going to be on the main Japanese islands, probably (as General Somervell indicated) on Formosa and some parts of the Asiatic mainland. And in the permanent garrisoning of the many

© 1945, by The New York Times, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bases ringing Japan, which we are expected to keep for our future security.

NEEDED TROOPS TO BE SENT

At least 1,500,000 of the 1,800,000 men now in the Pacific and Far East will be returned to the United States by next June 30, but new troops—in as great numbers as the military authorities decide are necessary—will go out to replace them.

There are great differences between the jobs in Germany and Japan. In the shattered ruins of the Reich, we took over from a thoroughly beaten army; in the land of the Rising Sun, we will take over from an army that we never met in force.

Although the Japanese Army laid down its arms because its leaders knew their cause was thoroughly hopeless, there is a great psychological difference. Experts here are firmly convinced we shall have to impress upon the Japanese that they were beaten, else there will be the makings for a renaissance of military spirit such as activated Germany in the years between her two defeats.

On this very question of the Japanese attitude, experts on Japanese psychology are far from happy over the broadcasts by a Tokyo spokesman identified as one Kusuo Oya, even after Emperor Hirohito's surrender. Among other things this person said:

". . . in spiritual power we have not lost yet. We do not think the way we have thought has been wrong. Of course, we do not say that we were right in everything. . . . We have lost, but this is temporary."

It will become most important, some authorities consider, to straighten out Japanese thinking on such points. Since the Japanese mind is not easy to tamper with, this is a job that will call for the most skillful type of planning and execution—a sort of program of psychological post-warfare.

It remains to be seen how skillfully we can do it. The success of our past excursions into psychological warfare fields has been, with some exceptions, a controversial subject.

The physical condition in which we will find Japan is another factor that alters the comparison with Germany. Although Japan took severe damage from our air forces, the aerial campaign against her was so relatively young that a greater proportion of the country is unscathed.

Nevertheless, we must rebuild certain ports, docks, bridges, railroads, motor roads and utility systems for the benefit of our occupation forces which will need them.

In the Potsdam declaration the United States, Britain and China declared that the war-making power of Japan shall be destroyed. The dismantling of her industry alone will be a gigantic job.

Authorities familiar with Japan point out, incidentally, that it is perfectly feasible to establish her as a self-sustaining nation, even after she has been deprived of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heavy industry formerly used to build up her potential for war.

The problem of bringing Japan's war criminals to justice also looms large. The Potsdam declaration promised the world that "stern justice shall be meted out to all war criminals, including those who have visited cruelties upon our prisoners."

Thus far it has not been disclosed whether President Truman would appoint a war crimes prosecutor who would fill a role in Japan similar to that occupied in Germany by Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson, or whether he would leave the prosecution duties to General MacArthur.

On the administrative side, the quick surrender may have been a little embarrassing. The Army's Civil Affairs Schools were training specialists for the Japanese theater rapidly, but the job will require several thousands more than have been trained.

The War Department is considering means of stepping up this training rapidly, but the results, particularly in view of the complexity of Japanese background and language, are bound to be somewhat sketchy.

High War Department sources have pointed out that our rule of Japan will differ radically from the German occupation in that the government of Emperor Hirohito will remain in existence, whereas in Germany the occupying military authorities are supreme.

This does not mean that the Emperor can "cross" General MacArthur, but the Emperor's government actually will be used as a means of restoring peace and reestablishing orderly procedure.

After the military influence has been purged from the government, existing Japanese civilian agencies probably will be permitted to resume their normal functions as usual under general supervision of the occupying forces.

There is considerable Washington interest in the question of Emperor Hirohito's ultimate future. This, of course, is a purely speculative matter, but informed opinion here seems to think that the little Emperor can survive so long as (a) the Japanese people continue to want him; and (b) his intentions and actions are sincere and effective.

Authorities on Japan here are not too discouraged on the prospects of ultimate cooperation from the Japanese people. Though they feel there is ground for treachery in the beginning unless we stamp out militaristic and subversive influences, they also feel that the proper sort of educational and administrative program, carried out over a reasonably lengthy period, will produce results.

Japan never will become an American style democracy, but her trouble-making proclivities at least can be curbed.

They feel that much depends on the carrying out of such a program, for an occupation army alone cannot win the peace, unless it is prepared to occupy the enemy's homeland forever.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dead Are Brought Back to Life

By Albert Deutsch
From his column in PM

A REMARKABLE case of bringing a dead man back to life is related in a recent issue of the *American Review of Soviet Medicine*. The case, reported by Dr. Sergei Belayev, was one in a series of strange and exciting experiments with resurrection in humans and animals.

In a battle against the Nazis in March, 1944, Valentin Cherepanov, a Red Army private, was gravely wounded in the thigh. He was brought to a field hospital and placed on the operating table. But he was beyond hope. Life ebbed out of him; heart action and respiration stopped; reflexes were absent. Private Cherepanov was dead.

The attending surgeon made his last entry in the man's case history:

"Death followed shock and acute hemorrhage on March 3, 1944, at 14:41."

The corpse wasn't wheeled out of the operating room; three and a half minutes after the man was pronounced dead, a group of medical scientists, headed by Prof. Vladimir Negovski, went to work on the body. Negovski is director of the experimental physiology laboratory of the All-Union Institute of Experimental Medicine, and his group had been working out methods at that field hospital for restoring to life men who died "prematurely" as a result of wounds.

The method discovered by Negovski and his co-workers is operated by simple mechanical methods:

Oxygen is supplied to the lungs directly by a pulmotor.

Blood is introduced not only into the brachial vein (the usual procedure in blood transfusions) but also to the artery, in the direction of the heart.

One minute after the scientists began work on the body of Private Cherepanov, the dead man's heart began to beat.

"After three minutes," writes Belayev, "respiration appeared. Death had retreated and life had returned to Cherepanov's body. Within an hour he had recovered consciousness. Then he fell into a doze. His name was called and he opened his eyes and answered questions. He asked for a drink. His breathing was even and his pulse regular.

"Today Cherepanov feels perfectly well, but he is under observation at the All-Union Institute of Experimental Medicine."

Cherepanov was one of 12

Copyright 1945, by PM, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wounded soldiers snatched from death by Prof. Negovski's group after the usual means of saving life had failed. The experiment was tried on 51 soldiers who died of injuries to internal organs or limbs. In the other 39 cases, life was temporarily restored for a few hours or days. The men, during this brief spell of resurrection, ate, drank, talked and even wrote letters, but died again.

The Soviet scientists aren't claiming miracles. They say simply that medical men must modify the traditional view that life ends irrevocably when respiration and blood circulation ceases. They insist that the symptoms now generally recognized as constituting "clinical death" do not really spell irreversible cessation of life. Their experiments are workable only on persons or animals experiencing "premature death" due to injuries to vital organs sustained in accidents or combat, and restorative operations in these cases must begin a very few minutes after "clinical death" has set in.

A translated article by Prof. Negovski himself, describing life-restoring experiments with 250 "clinically dead" dogs, many of them successful, also appears in the *Review*, published by the same American-Soviet Medical Society, 130 West 46th St., New York City.

Pompeii's Streets Were Paved With Glass

By Richard T. F. Harding

From his column "The Byproduct" in The Cleveland Plain Dealer

GLASS manufacturers who turn part of their output into curtains, neckties, insulation and stuffing for mattresses are in the front of the parade of enterprise and imagination. Those who offer glass blocks as building material are no less notable for promoting novelties, but historically they are not doing much more than repeat and improve on what the Romans were doing long ago. Excavations indicate that parts of Pompeii were paved with glass. Necktie makers found no such suggestion in the ancient ruins because at the time Vesuvius boiled over that city the necktie had not been invented, which was one of the advantages of Pompeiian life and times over ours. But to show that the weaving idea did not occur to the trade only yesterday, it should be recalled that at the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893 one of the most remarked minor exhibits was a glass dress. The fabric did not

Copyright 1945, by The Cleveland Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have the pliability of present products of the kind, but its existence shows that makers then as now were looking for new outlets for their wares and to that end were prosecuting research as well as they knew how. That they called the process experimenting in no way proves them either simple-hearted or simple-minded.

Glassmaking has been a restless business ever since it grew—if tradition may be accepted—out of the accidental melting of the right kind of sand in a Phoenician's outdoor fire. As the story goes, the slug of strange material drawn out of the ashes set the finder wondering and working, with the ultimate result of an important trade around the Mediterranean.

Invention followed invention, with the decorative value of highly-colored baubles for a long time its chief stimulus, as it is today in the costume jewelry trade. After a time someone learned—it seems again to have been a Phoenician—to make the material into containers, thereby opening a profitable market in Rome. Egyptians and Babylonians seem to have ignored glass and, oddly enough, no one has arisen to say the Chinese had it long before anyone else.

It was the Romans who put glass into windows, thereby opening the bread-and-butter business of the industry. They did not at first make the glass, they merely demanded it. Those of them who moved into central Europe to administer affairs of the empire as it expanded among the barbarians needed shelter against the winters of the higher altitude.

Some had observed enough of the superior translucence of glass, even in its crude form of that day, to make them prefer it to the alabaster slabs with which the windows of their houses at home had been stopped. They had learned about it from Egyptian peddlers, who seem in this instance to have outpeddled the Phoenicians, placed bulk orders with them, and the window glass business was really on the way.

In their early days glass windows were of small, colored panes, the only kind the industry knew how to produce for the purpose. The size was controlled by the shovels in which the panes were melted and cooled. Most of the color was caused by the presence of metallic impurities; some of it was added by staining.

When the Romans began to manufacture they improved the process by pouring molten glass on a smooth rock that had been dusted with sand. That produced a large sheet, but it was not transparent because rough on the sanded side. But without doubt, suggestions contained in that method led to the first manufacture of smooth glass, especially to the plate which has been of first importance in windows and mirrors. Venice, in the 15th or 16th century, gave the material the modern characteristic of transparence.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Psychology Didn't Win the War

From the column "Topics of the Time" in The New York Times

SIX years of world war have seen many things exploded other than the atom. Traditions, reputations and superstitions have collapsed. About the long-lived propaganda-psychology fetish a person cannot be too sure. The record is not one to which the so-called psychological warfare can point with pride. To the extent that propaganda offices and offices of war information may have been of some use it would be in the domestic field, which is a service not to be despised. To keep up home morale is obviously a contribution to victory.

Home propaganda, however, is not what most people have in mind when they justify the heavy money cost of psychological warfare, and its risks. They think of propaganda as a projectile hurled against the enemy. Printed words are showered upon enemy populations from airplanes. Spoken words are "beamed" directly into enemy ears. And under the verbal barrage the enemy morale disintegrates and enemy resistance collapses.

It is hard to think of anything in the last six years of warfare that corresponds with this exalted picture of propaganda as a weapon, or that even approaches it. Nevertheless the propaganda fetish will probably linger. This may not be a compliment to people's respect for facts and logic but it is not to the discredit of our human nature.

The higher part in us wants to believe that the word is mightier than the sword, and that the spirit can sway man more effectively than he is moved by material circumstances. The word persuades or converts an enemy where the sword or the bomb merely beats him down. The Germans after 1918 declared that Woodrow Wilson had double-crossed them with his Fourteen Points. People here at home spoke of Woodrow Wilson shattering German resistance with his psychological weapons. It was intended as a tribute to Woodrow Wilson and to all of us. Wars could be won by spiritual weapons.

That is why it is likely that war propaganda and psychology will retain their hold on the popular imagination in spite of the facts; in spite of the fact that Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points remained ineffective for nearly a year until the German armies were beaten in the field; in spite of the fact that German resistance in the recent war withstood the

Copyright 1945, by The New York Times, New York, New York

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

impact of Allied psychological warfare to the very end and yielded only to crushing material defeat; in spite of the fact that Allied propaganda in earlier stages of the war was a fiasco in the Middle East as long as German arms held the lead in North Africa, but Allied propoganda developed amazing vitality when Alexander and Montgomery began chasing Rommel from the Nile.

Millions of leaflets were showered on Japan in the last weeks of the war, and no doubt the future romantic interpretation will ascribe Japan's surrender to the Allied psychology barrage. It will be overlooked that the psychological warfare was a dud until Japan's navy had been destroyed and the destruction of the mainland was speeded up with a rush by the atomic bomb.

What was the Nazi propaganda that brought Mussolini into the war against France? The collapse of France. Had the Hitler armies been driven back at Sedan is there any doubt that Mussolini would have remained "neutral" and would even have done his best to join the victorious Allies? The propaganda that brought the Japanese to the aid of Hitler and to their own downfall was the fact that the Nazi armies in December, 1941, were standing at the gates of Moscow and Leningrad.

The spell of "psychology" is strong on many of us to the very last. Many of us still believe that by a single act, like that of tolerating or ejecting Hirohito, we create a Japanase popular "psychology" which will precipitate or prevent another world war "in a generation." But when the Allied governments decided to keep Hirohito it was for no such profound long-distance psychological strategies. They accepted the Emperor as the readiest instrument for liquidating the present war.

The most fruitful psychological effects are not produced by "psychological" weapons but by material weapons. To re-educate an aggressor nation into a law-abiding nation there is nothing so effective as a smashing defeat. In an obstinate case the dose may have to be repeated. German aggressive psychology thrived on the fact that in three lightning wars, lasting six weeks each, Bismarck built the mighty German Empire. Now the German people have learned, for the second time in twenty-five years, that there are no more six-week wars. There are long world wars in which Germany always comes out worst.

One such lesson may be enough for Japan. If she tries again in 1970 it will not be because of what we have done with Hirohito in 1945, but only if Japan in 1970 feels herself strong and considers her opponents weak and divided.

* * *

● In the furor over the atom bomb, we are forgetting radar, which in one way is even more wonderful: read backwards it spells radar.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Journey to a Bright Land

At last, at longest last,
He had found
The bright land that lay past
The dark ground . . .
That lay past the thick trees
And the difficult thick trees
And the difficult rivers
Where bones are racked of ease,
Where ague and fevers
Beset the traveller's going
In uncertain light,
Guided by some deep knowing,
Not sense, not sight,
To a bright land and a sky
That is his, and blue . . .
And the traveller was I,
And the bright land was you.

Accompaniment

Meadows were white and gold
The way we came along,
And tired thought was sold
For a thrush's song.

And it was you who said:
"The way of the world ends here,
Our path has somehow led
So far from hate and fear

And the world's way of war
And the world's evil powers,
We walk another star
Whose climate is song and flowers" . . .

But I was thinking, then,
How verse, the gentle-voiced
Thrush among raucous men
Rejoices and has rejoiced

And will, however long,
However dark, the time . . .
The shapely and gentle and strong
Voice of our verse will climb
Above the outsoared wrong.

DAVID MORTON

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Theatre Arts

By John Gassner

At this writing, the drama critic turns with eager eyes to the new Broadway season which will open officially with an elaborate musical comedy, *Mr. Strauss Goes to Boston*, which appropriately opened in Boston. . . . If trepidation is apparent in the critic's eye, the reason is not far to seek. Will the theatre be able to adjust itself to a peace-time world within the next nine months? And will that adjustment involve the scuttling of all serious attitudes and the blatant catering to our sense of relief from anxieties and hopes? It is too early to tell, and discretion would dictate an avoidance of refutable prophecies. Whenever the critic finds himself talking about developments he cannot gauge beforehand, he relies upon editorializing.

But surely there is no iota of editorial matter that hasn't been explored in print. It is plainly a desideratum for the American theatre to solve the burdens imposed upon it by the heavy costs of production if there is to be any consistency of serious and experimental effort. How is this to be accomplished? From long experience I should say that this will not be accomplished, unless the entire business world suffers a drastic deflation. And who wants deflation? It is also desirable to have a national theatre, something on the order of the Federal Theatre Project of the depression years, without the depression, without the inhibiting relief status of actors, producers and directors. Plans along these lines are actually drawn up, and important legislators and military men (who have the interest of war veterans at heart), as well as theatre leaders, are promising their support. But who can tell whether, and when, the plan will be put into effective operation? Meanwhile the theatre, such as it is, must go on, and go on it will.

Then there are the dreamers and estheticians. They score many valid points. Their revelations are not new, some of them having been conceived, and even exhibited practically, by the Duke of Saxe-Meiningen, Adolphe Appia, Gordon Craig, Max Reinhard, and Robert Edmond Jones decades and decades ago. But their views are still to be put into practice on a large scale. One *Glass Menagerie* production doesn't constitute theatrical practice; and the application of "space-stage" technique, special lighting effects, and other modes of modern theatricalism to shoddy musical comedies and revues is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mere bastardization of the dreams of Gordon Craig. Yet there is no need for worrying greatly about production procedures. Never has there been a season since 1918 that has failed to prove how easily, and how well, the American theatre can excel in the artistry of production. The shoe pinches on the other foot: Let the playwrights provide interesting plays and stagecraft will not let them down.

Where are the playwrights? One would suppose that they were everywhere—young and old, tried and untried, or nascent. Well, they are everywhere and nowhere. One cannot legislate or editorialize them into being — certainly we cannot make them better by means of injunctions to do this and that. The truth of the matter is that the drama is at the crossroads. Three generations of playwrights are operating today. Each of them has possibilities, each of them has limitations. All we can do is take stock of their qualities and watch and pray.

The first generation consists of old-timers, so to speak. They are the men (O'Neil, Rice, Anderson, Sherwood, Behrman, the Spewacks, etc.) who grew to maturity and acquired prominence during the early 'twenties when the American theatre became modernized. Most of them are still alive and active. Many of them—Rice, Behrman, Sherwood, the Spewacks, Lynn Riggs—will be represented by new plays in the 1944-45 season. They bring a heritage of past struggles, either resolved or continuing; they bring experience, sophistication, literateness to our theatre. No doubt many of them have also been enriched by the travails they have witnessed during the depression and the war. If past performance is a criterion, their plays should contribute greatly to the competence of the stage. But little freshness can be expected from them, because their attitudes and techniques are familiar and they cannot change their idiom. They have said their lines so well before that all we can hope is that there will be no anticlimax. They can be expected to acquit themselves well, but not very excitingly.

There is a second generation consisting of the writers who grew up during the depression under the shadow of the social and political theatre of the 'thirties. There were able playwrights in their ranks—Odets, Irwin Shaw, Sidney Kingsley, Lillian Hellman. Intelligent drama is to be expected of them. But their visions are familiar, and we know their tempera ture readings. If anything, we are likely to find them more moderate than they were during the heat of social conflicts of the 'thirties, and part of their singularity came from their intensity of protest and social vision. Finally there is the third generation of the young writers who are bound to emerge from the war. We know nothing more about them than this. Perhaps they will surprise us.

Can anything be done to assure a new theatre for ourselves? Perhaps not. Writers create as they must, as they are impelled, and a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they feel like creating. But such negative conclusions would not be worth putting on paper. Nor are they quite correct. The theatre must attract the new talent, and keep it; we must give the fledglings an opportunity to try their wings; and we must point out directions of flight. And all this is not a matter of generalization but of simple materialization.

The successful producers should put aside a fund to sustain new playwrights and try out maiden efforts at university, community, and summer theatres. These theatres have always been available to plays that have fallen into stereotypes, into the mould of the kind of plays that have previously proved successful on Broadway—with the result that we have brought forth a flock of new playwrights who merely ape the gyrations of their elders and perform them less efficiently. The try-out theatres must be opened exclusively to original efforts no matter how crude, provided they are genuine, provided they come from the heart and soul of their creators. In short, creativeness and not expertness must be the criterion.

The theatre has remained impoverished by and large because too many playwrights have tried to play the same game—and a game, indeed, is what most playwriting has become. Most men write books in order to express themselves. Too many playwrights, who have ignored the excellent example of Eugene O'Neill, have written plays not to express themselves but to anticipate the desires of producers and audiences. Playwrights have been veering and tacking to catch a favorable wind. They have not moved ahead on their own steam, driven by some deep compulsion, conviction or even impulse. In the few exceptions that could be noted since 1930—in, let us say, an *Awake and Sing, My Heart's in the Highlands, On the Town*, and *The Glass Menagerie*—new talents came to the fore with fresh breezes blowing around them, and the discriminating public discovered them instantly with exhilaration and delight.

American playwriting has, on the whole, become too professionalized and too detached. The result has too often been stage-carpentry rather than drama. We have encouraged depersonalization, craft specialization, cleverness. We must now encourage the creation of plays as personal as a private experience. The risk of encouraging excess and eccentricity is worth taking. Broadway is naturally not the place for making such experiments in the first instance. We can only commend the wisdom of Eddie Dowling and Louis Singer when they opened *The Glass Menagerie* as a Chicago project. We can only approve of Margot Jones's project at the Dallas Little Theatre in Texas, from which Arnold Sundgaard's highly original play *The Great Campaign* will be graduating to Broadway in the next few months. Sawyer Falk at the University of Syracuse, where *Harriet* was first tried out, may have fathered another

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

masterpiece in trying out Dan Totheroh's poetic mid-Western tragedy *Live Life Again*, which Broadway will see shortly. This is so much better than wasting the wonderful resources of many university theatres throughout the United States on revivals of second-rate Broadway successes in the fields of comedy and farce. And in this connection it must be noted that University authorities can do nothing as meretricious as their insistence that college dramatics pay its own way at the box-office, unless they make it a policy to exempt new plays from this restriction.

Undoubtedly style cannot be imposed upon a writer. "Style is the man," said Buffon. But style can be *beaten out* of the playwright, and it is constantly being beaten out of him by the uniformities of standard construction and dialogue upon which producers, critics, and Broadway audiences insist. The one-set play is favored on the grounds of economy and unity, and many young writers wriggle themselves into a straitjacket or are forced into one when their natural talent requires numerous settings for proper expression. We may well wonder how well Shakespeare would have accommodated himself to the one-set requirement. We don't have to wonder—we know how much his plays would have lost if his epic themes and his comedies of adventure and romance could not have flown unimpeded from background to background in as many as forty-two scenes. We need only compare *Antony and Cleopatra* and John Dryden's competent late seventeenth century adaptation under the title of *All for Love*. The original is a tragic history in which the love story of Antony and Cleopatra achieves the dimensions and meaningfulness of great drama. The adaptation which observed the unities of time and place is merely a love story concerning characters who happened to be people of historical importance. A comparison that comes closer to home can also be drawn between the familiar problem plays in which broad social issues are reduced to an argument over the breakfast table and a "living newspaper" drama like *One-third of a Nation*. In this Federal Theatre Play, the housing problem was panoramically exhibited, achieved epic proportions appropriate to the subject, and communicated illumination and excitement to a theme that would otherwise have been as depressing as its inevitable setting—a room in a slum tenement—without ever actually dramatizing the causes, complications, and consequences that alone can give meaning to the story.

Toward dialogue, it is true, the conventional theatre maintains greater catholicity. The dialogue can be literary or in dialect, can be grave and gay, and can even be eloquent. Nevertheless, it is almost an unwritten law that genuine modern poetry is to be regarded as an interloper on the stage. At most, poetry will be tolerated if it sounds like prose with purple patches, if it is formless or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

merely poetic, or if the author mistakes rhetoric for poetry. Yet it is obvious that no great theatre has ever failed to draw the poet into its orbit. It may be argued that poetry, especially the modern variety, is difficult to follow. That may be so, but the poet, if given a hearing in the theatre, is bound to adapt himself to conditions of the stage, and a carefully executed production can actually make the most difficult poetry more understandable in the theatre than in the library. Settings, lighting, delivery, gesture, and stage business can exhibit and explain the poet's words. T. S. Eliot is accounted one of our most difficult poets; Eliot has actually propounded a conviction that good modern poetry *must* be difficult. Yet Eliot's *Murder in the Cathedral* was crystal clear on the stage. There are many poets in our midst, and it is unfortunate both for them and for the stage that they should confine themselves to the printed page, as they must when Broadway (as well as most community and college theatres) refuses them a hearing. The poet remains poor and isolated, he rarely reaches a public beyond the insignificant cliques, and he begins to talk a private language, while the theatre remains stammering, tongue-tied and commonplace even when its themes could be sounded on violins and trumpets. In rare instances, when a poet does write a play, he must content himself with publishing it, as in the case of Stanley Burnshaw's recently printed noble drama of bridging of the present and the future world, *The Bridge* (The Dryden Press). No one benefits thereby—neither the poet nor the public of the theatre; no one, except a handful of readers.

* * * ○

● Physicians say one million women are over-weight. These, of course, are round figures.

—*Judy's*

* * *

● A mining man had passed on and appeared at the pearly gates for admittance into Heaven. A quota plan had been instituted, however, and our mining man was so informed, and further told that there at present was no room for him.

What to do? Thinking several minutes the miner turned to St. Paul and asked, "Can the other mining men in Heaven hear me if I shout?" Receiving an affirmative answer, he loudly called out, "Gold has been discovered in Hell!" This precipitated an immediate and disorderly exodus to the realm of Mephistopheles.

St. Peter turned to the man and said, "You may go in now." But the mining man turned on his heel and, as he hurried down the short route to the nether regions, called back, "There may be something in that rumor after all!"

—*South African Forum*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Brief

By Jasper R. Lewis

SOUTH AMERICA'S OPINION OF U.S., AND VICE VERSA

WITHOUT doubt, it should be salutary for us to stop and see ourselves as others see us, and by the same token it will be enlightening to the others to read what at least one serious investigator thinks of them.

What the South American Thinks of Us, by Carleton Beals, Herschel Brickell, Samuel Guy Inman and Bryce Oliver, (McBride, $3.00), is what the authors believe are the opinions of our distant neighbors. In some instances it might be well to remember, then, that the South Americans themselves are not reporting.

The symposium is by no means flattering to the United States. More, the experts whose work it is apparently accept the opinions of our friends there at face value, sometimes stating their premises as though there could be no question of their correctness or importance.

Writing of Peru, for example, Carleton Beals, in stating that nation's objections to a postwar organization, thinks that "Peru simply cannot dissociate herself from Chile, Brazil and Argentina. There is also the important question of Oriental relationships, especially with Japan." One ventures the thought that if Peru must tie in with fascist-minded Argentina and Brazil, or worry about her future trade with Japan, then South American opinions are in need of education, rather than exposition. Beals points out, with pertinent examples, the causes of South America's scepticism of the stability and honesty of our policies, and here he is on sure ground. The record is full of wavering, indecisive adventures in political and commercial diplomacy.

In Bolivia, a handful rules an ignorant, downtrodden mass; the tin cartel and its hirelings practically hold the country in slavery. The choice of Nelson Rockefeller as South American Co-ordinator was flaunting the power and sins of Standard Oil in the people's faces. Still, what Bolivia's leaders think seems mostly a matter of what will Uncle Sam do for or give to Bolivia. One can understand the fear of financial control by Wall Street and the big corporations. Even here it seems unfair to confine this fear to American institutions; British, German and French exploiters have been as rapacious in the past.

In some of the countries, a politically-minded Church, combined with the feudal ruling classes, formulates the opinions, which are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unfavorable to the United States and seem based largely on a desire to perpetuate its own existence. The greatest fault is our failure to reach the masses which, under the conditions, is not hard to understand.

Sentiment in Brazil, according to Bryce Oliver, is unfriendly to us because of our many errors in judgment, and President Vargas, unless we misunderstand the author, is only a dictator for the sake of his people. In fact, he is "the perfect political leader."

Hirschell Brickell writes on Venezuela and Colombia and finds them democratic in their objectives and friendly toward us. It comes almost as a shock to find any kind word for us from South America, but Brickell thinks the doubts in those two countries stem chiefly from fear of our hasty exit after the needs of the war are liquidated.

The part of the book most difficult to sympathize with is Samuel Guy Inman's section on Argentina and Chile. Inman portrays the former as a country of big industrialists and farm owners, and a mass of ignorant toilers who are just peons. This seems perfectly true. The "top drawer" is in favor of any regime that will secure its own position. He describes the "important people" as delightful, hospitable and democratic; the opponents of the United States have been the best brains of Argentina, as well as the leaders in moral reform. There are hopes that if the Argentines recover their liberties from the dictatorial group, overdue emphasis on social questions will come to the fore, but if the leaders up to now have aligned themselves with the dictators, who is to lead the way?

Inman feels that relations have already deteriorated. Argentina's leaning toward the Axis was rather a leaning away from us. Since the infiltration of German influence during the war is commonly known, it is not easy to accept his views, which have the hallmark of agreement with the aforesaid "top drawer" element.

Now take, and I warmly recommend it, *South America Uncensored* by Roland Hall Sharp (Longmans, Green, $3.50). Sharp's background of staff correspondent for *The Christian Science Monitor* merits the assumption that he has investigated fairly and weighed conservatively. He doesn't seem to see the same things the experts write about; although in over 100,000 miles of travel he has observed some of the same defects of our policies, he differentiates between the fascist ruling classes and the liberal minded masses.

The inconsistency of our supporting Dictator Vargas in Brazil, and frowning on the same type of leader in Argentina does lay us open to criticism, and surely does tighten Vargas' grip. Argentina is definitely the refuge for world fascism, and this is solely because of the ruling class. Labor and farm workers have no voice in politics; labor is mishandled generally, not alone in Argentina, but elsewhere. The Indians, partic-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ularly in the Patino tin mines in Bolivia, are victims of cruelty and despotism, all in the name of aiding the United Nations by producing raw materials. The rich live lavishly, Patino spending $30,000,000 on residences and doing nothing for social welfare.

The doctrine of good-neighborliness appears to have been largely bunk, suffering from the demands of expediency. Sharp recites some examples of ineptness in our ideas of propaganda to build good will, and these are definitely known. One fact is noticeable: he thinks it is "a prime necessity to meet the United States halfway"—not for us to go all the way to meet the South Americans.

In a section, "Portrait of a Continent," he gives an excellent picture of the countries, the difficult physical geography and the natural obstacles to progress. In contrast to the poverty and filth, however, he finds admiration for some of the native population; for instance, the Peruvian Indians, free from the mixtures of Spanish blood of the old conquests. Amidst his political and economic comments he finds time to translate the beauties of the scenery to paper; here is a real travelogue, detailed and with a note of careful observation throughout.

Coming to the question of the future, he thinks South Americans will respect us for being more realistic and less romantic. The difficulties facing agricultural development, the overworked mines, are obstacles too little understood by us. The Ford rubber plantation proved a failure, except for experimental purposes, largely because of natural difficulties alien to the knowledge of the foreign developer.

The net conclusion is that in many ways South America is its own enemy; science and education have their tasks before them, but the ironbound customs and the selfishness of the ruling class apparently are the greatest hurdles over which South America must struggle to modernize itself. The greatest need is a change of attitude among the ruling class. Sharp's basic belief is that people make a country; the masses have been oppressed by social, religious, geographical and political circumstances. Democracy, purer forms of religion, plain cleanliness and initiative in learning, are fighting their way up, and fascism will lose out.

Sharp's book is a wholesome and discerning outlook on a subject that has not before had such a balanced and frank exposition.

BRIEFER COMMENT

WAR

Mission Beyond Darkness by Lt. Com. Joseph Bryan III, USNR, and Philip Reed, (Duell, Sloan & Pearce, $2.00), is the battle record of an Air Group of the carrier Lexington. It is said to be factual, with few trimmings, and makes a simply told but stirring story.

It is the distaff side of war, but it belong to the record, too. Mar-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

got Kurtz in *My Rival, the Sky*, (Putnam, $2.50), tells about her combat pilot husband, Frank Kurtz, her meetings with him between assignments, and their partings. It is sincere, frank and unashamed in its admissions; it is probably the story of many an airman's wife.

All of the travail of birth is in *The Superfortress Is Born* by Thomas Collison (Duell, Sloan & Pearce, $3.00). The conception of it, creation and production; the tests, and unfortunately, the tragedies of early experiments, before this huge weapon was perfected. It is well told, detailed and sufficiently technical to be an adequate description.

Yet another vista of military life is in *Proceed Without Delay* by Sgt. Thomas R. St. George (Crowell, $2.00). In the South Pacific the author found fun, made recreation, evaded regulations if necessary, and generally tried to make life livable during off hours. It is amusing in spots, revealing in others, and an altogether interesting history of GI life.

BIOGRAPHICAL

One Who Survived by Alexander Barmine (Putnam, $3.75), is a disturbing book. Barmine was a soldier in the Russian revolution, a diplomat stationed in Greece, a "member of the Party" and eventually a fugitive from the disciples of liquidation. His book is a revelation of the terror that has ruled Russia under Stalin, documented with names and dates, but without resort to theatrical exposures of the measures of cruelty. The author evaded death in 1937 by leaving his legation and going to Paris, later coming here. It is a story of treachery, opportunism and betrayal of principles. If his statements are true, those who distrust and fear Stalin have ample cause. Beside being educational, the volume is an exciting narrative.

The non-military side of the hero of Gettysburg shows him to have been a roaring, tough old bird, something of a soldier of fortune, and a gay blade with the ladies. *Dan Sickles, Yankee King of Spain,* by Edgcumb Pinchon (Doubleday, Doran, $3.50), is a live, amusing and enlightening tale of the general's private life and some of his war exploits.

Home to India by Santha Rama Rau (Harper's, $2.50), is a pleasant introduction into the Brahmin household of the author, after her return upon graduation from Wellesley. It gives pictures of Indian life, although as a literary product it is not particularly notable. "They ate with their fingers," although "the technique was hard to master, particularly with liquids."

A woman's point of view of life in the Aleutians may serve the purpose of discouraging any hardy souls who think they would like it. *Prekaska's Wife,* by Helen Wheaton (Dodd, Mead, $3.00), relates Mrs. Wheaton's experiences as the wife of the storekeeper at Kiska. Modestly if not too well told, it is descriptive of the odd customs of the natives and inci-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dentally of the job of keeping the native women away from one's own husband.

IDEAS

Otto F. Reiss has compiled a number of instances to show how the experts create "planned brainstorms." *How to Develop Profitable Ideas* (Prentice-Hall, $3.00), relates some of the methods and the sources of new stunts, in the ever present race for profitable business, including some well known current examples of successful adaptation of basic ideas.

FICTION

The soldier's return is a common theme today, but J. B. Priestly does a fine job of conveying a message in *Three Men in New Suits* (Harper's, $2.50). The three men just released from service meet their new civilian problems directly and with the dissatisfied reactions natural after years of war. The story is simple, well if not brilliantly told, but the message is the important thing. Will the world go back to its prewar blindness of social selfishness?

If you would like the illusion of seeing the war and manipulations of power by the bigwigs from the inside, read *Dragon Harvest* by Upton Sinclair (Viking, $3.00). Lanny Budd, his American hero secret agent, lives through the days of Hitler's rise and early successes. It makes lively reading with an historical background.

Laughter on the Hill by Margaret Parton (Whittlesey House, $2.75), is her story of Bohemian life in San Francisco as she saw it in her early newspaperwoman's career. The bits of pseudo-historical description of people and events are entertaining, which is more than can be said of the peculiar people she met and played with in her working hours and after.

Ferenc Molnar's *Farewell My Heart* (Simon & Schuster, $2.00), is the somewhat unbelievable and sticky love story of a fifty year old Hungarian refugee correspondent and twenty-one year old refugee dancer. It is mildly entertaining in the French tradition, rather thin, and quite unconvincing.

The age-long problem of Jew and Gentile and the intolerance of almost every people for every other, is the basis for *By the Waters of Babylon*, by Stephen Lister (Dodd, Mead, $2.50). It is a change from the run of current fiction, with frank expressions of problems that exist, and a setting of current life against a background of the prejudices and customs of long ago.

* * *

● "At the present time composers are not following the old masters, but writing something which has no past, and, in most cases, no future."

—Sir Thomas Beecham

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Classics and the Censor

By Sydney J. Harris

From his column "Strictly Personal" in The Chicago Daily News

"A CLASSIC," said Mark Twain, "is a book that everybody wants to have read and nobody wants to read."

Much of Shakespeare is spicier than *Forever Amber*, in addition to being pretty fair literature, but millions of young people studiously avoid reading him out of school because he is embalmed as a Classic.

There is more frankness in the writings of Martial and Juvenal than you will find in Joyce or Hemingway, and Aristophanes makes Bernard Shaw sound as decorous as a deacon. They can't help it if we call them Classics.

Mortimer Adler could have devised no faster way of killing off the world's literary masterpieces than by labeling them the "100 Great Books."

The way to make the Classics popular is to crack down on them. Get them banned in Boston or burned in Tennessee.

Then the publishers could set up a black market in the original editions, bootlegging their books the way "Lady Chatterly's Lover" was smuggled in after the last war and peddled on dark streets like French post cards. Yum-yum.

Mortimer would have done better if he had denounced the Great Books as being injurious to youthful morals and forbade all his students to read any of them.

What the Classics really need is a concerted campaign by ministers, judges and Parent-Teacher Associations, screaming that Shakespeare is bawdy (as he often is) and that Plato is a dangerous radical (as he often is). The cops could slap a $25 fine on anyone caught with a copy of "Oedipus Rex" in his possession, and the bookeasies would spring up like gin mills in the Volstead era.

What the post office censors did for the Varga Girl, they could also do for Dante's Beatrice and Petrarch's Laura, by banning these immodest maidens from the nation's bookstores. There is no surer path to popularity.

Of course, the Classics are not lewd in any sense of the word. But they are human and earthly and full of excitement and vitality—which is something the professors forget to mention in their dry dissertations on "The Use of the Metaphor in Shakespeare" and "The Effect of the Compound Predicate in Pope's Heroic Couplets."

If we can just rescue the Great Books from the Small Teachers, they might stand a chance of getting read.

Copyright 1945, by The Chicago Daily News, Chicago, Illinois

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Blame For Pearl Harbor . . .

The official reports on the Pearl Harbor tragedy arouse widespread criticism:

THEY DIDN'T BELIEVE IT COULD HAPPEN

The reason why we were surprised at Pearl Harbor is fundamentally simple. It was not considered practical for the Japs to do what they did.

The imminence of war was recognized by everyone in authority. It was believed certain after the Hull "ultimatum" of November 27. Though a surprise attack on Pearl Harbor was considered remotely possible, nobody either in the Hawaiian command or at Washington really thought it could happen. From President Roosevelt on down, the commanders expected an attack in the Western Pacific, but not on Hawaii.

On January 24, 1941, Secretary Knox sent to Secretary Stimson a note recommending preparation at Hawaii against various possibilities of attack on the naval base. They included air bombing, air torpedoes, sabotage, submarines, mines and naval bombardment. The existing defenses were considered good except against air bombs and torpedoes. A program, including radar warning signals, was started to provide the needed protection. It was nearly completed but not in regular use by December 7.

Ambassador Grew in Tokyo reported on January 27 rumors that Japan planned a surprise attack on Hawaii.

The official attitude at Washington toward this possibility is well illustrated by the Navy Department comment transmitting this report. The department "placed no credence" in these rumors and did not regard it as practical in the "foreseeable future."

President Truman has kept secret the source of our intelligence about the enemy. So we do not know where the government got the tip on the very eve of the attack that such a thing might happen quickly.

They did not handle the tip rapidly. It was not telephoned to Admiral Kimmel, but cabled in code. It was not received and decoded until the attack was over. The message to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

General Short was late, too, though there was plenty of time to have reached him, the report says.

This delay is only to be understood in view of the established conviction prevailing in the high command at Washington that the Japanese did not have the means or the skill to deliver on Pearl Harbor the kind of an attack they did.

—*Chicago Daily News*

* * *

AFTER PEARL HARBOR

The picture of bad judgment, stale thinking and somnolence revealed by the Pearl Harbor reports is alarming. We escaped the consequences of failure in military and naval command, of failure on the part of our diplomats and intelligence services because the Japs were slow to understand their success, and because we have the greatest industrial recuperative power on earth.

But just suppose the Japs could have hit us a thousand times as fast and as hard. The consequences would have been immediate and irreparable.

Well, the "just suppose" era is here. We can never again afford not to be ready. Not in an age when an atomic warhead could be attached to the nose of a rocket capable of travelling thousands of miles at the rate of 3,500 m.p.h.

Clearly, there is fault in the inadequacy of intelligence from our diplomats, in the fashion through which responsibility was divided or evaded with almost fatal results.

We need a new type of diplomat, rather than the bespatted kind that prepared us so poorly for the Pearl Harbor attack; we need among our officers more of the kind of leadership demonstrated by civilians Roosevelt and Churchill when they spent $2,000,000,000 on the atomic bomb gamble, and less of the kind of leadership that led to Pearl Harbor.

Much more is involved here than a decision to courtmartial or not to courtmartial Kimmel and Short. We don't need a whipping boy. We do need to avoid future Pearl Harbors, when a sudden attack, catching us unprepared, will mean immediate and total defeat.

—*New York Post*

* * *

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOUND AND SENSIBLE

It seems to us that President Truman's views of the Pearl Harbor reports were sound and sensible.

The chief executive feels that the nation as a whole was largely responsible for our lack of preparedness in 1941 and obviously believes nothing will be gained by proceeding with courts-martial at this late date. He is perfectly willing, however, that General Short and Admiral Kimmel speak out in their own defense if they believe they have been blamed unfairly.

We hope that members of Congress who again are demanding that those responsible for our losses at Pearl Harbor be punished consider carefully all the aspects of the situation before they determine to go beyond the findings of the army and navy boards of inquiry.

They may be certain that their own records and positions of rearmament and preparedness will be carefully scrutinized and properly so. For as a matter of fact Congress was extremely slow to move in the direction of a sound and prudent policy of national defense.

One of the considerations which leads us to believe the army and navy have turned up the great mass of evidence on the disaster is the fact that extremists on neither side are satisfied, one group characterizing the reports as a whitewash and the other finding in them a smear of innocent men.

—*The Cleveland Plain Dealer*

* * *

DON'T BLAME THE PEOPLE

Comenting on the Pearl Harbor reports, Admiral Ernest J. King says *"the country as a whole is basically responsible in that the people were unwilling to support an adequate Army and Navy until it was too late. . . ."*

Other naval officers are taking up the cry. And we are sorry to see that President Truman has followed along, observing that "the country is as much to blame as any individual."

There is one fault with this contention. It is not correct.

Were the American people to blame because there was no alert against a surprise attack at Pearl Harbor?

Were they to blame because no long-range reconnaissance planes were out on December 7, 1941? Or because the radar defense (the public had never heard of radar then) was badly organized?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Was it John Q. American who failed to order ammunition distributed to mobile Army antiaircraft units?

Was it the American people who neglected to disperse the planes on the airfields—so that when the enemy struck our planes were wing-to-wing and a Jap bomb couldn't miss?

Was it the fault of the American people that the Navy had all its big eggs in one basket?

Was it the fault of our people that Washington officials didn't keep Kimmel and Short informed on the imminence of war?

The American people knew nothing about these things. They were "military secrets."

But had the people known, we are quite sure they would have raised seven kinds of hell to get the negligence remedied.

The truth, in black and white and in dollars and cents, is that the nation never pinched pennies on Pearl Harbor. The program to make it a "Pacific Gibraltar" had been popular, with Congress and with the people, for years.

Our nation was slow in urging preparedness, although the record shows that President Roosevelt, despite noisy opposition, got most of the defense funds he asked. When he asked a $5,000,000,000 defense program in July of 1940, he got it.

As for Pearl Harbor itself, from 1923 to mid-1941, more than $600,000,000 has been spent on it, with more to come.

It was in 1938 that a 20-year program to make Pearl Harbor a "Pacific Gibraltar" was *completed,* and a new program launched.

We were told then that construction had begun on the Army's $18,000,000 Hickam Field, where our planes were pounded to pieces. We were told of a vast $2,000,000 underground storage depot, which contained $20,000,000 worth of ammunition.

We were told that Pearl Harbor had our "largest scouting force" (that was in 1939), that the great forts in the harbor were impregnable, that our huge oil storage tanks were underground, that Pearl Harbor was a "combination of Gibraltar and Singapore."

The country gladly paid for all that.

We agreed with President Truman when he said that the Army Board of Inquiry was off base when it criticized Secretary Hull. We believe he is even further off base than the Board when he says "the country is as much to blame as any individual." —*Philadelphia Record*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG.
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Victory

The nation slowly came to the realization that total victory can be as much of a problem as total war. Specifically, it brought up the question of the occupation of Japan. To the last, the Japanese had attempted to salvage what they could of their broken pride, to "save face." It was not until General Douglas MacArthur sternly demanded that they get down to business that envoys were finally sent to Manila to negotiate preliminary terms.

The delegation, headed by Lieutenant General Torashiro Kawabe, vice chief of the Army General Staff, landed in the Philippine capital on August 19. The army's reception was cool. The instructions, more than 24 pages long, were handed to the envoy by Lieutenant General Richard K. Sutherland, MacArthur's chief of staff. The delegation never got to see the "top man" before it was whisked back to Tokyo by plane.

General MacArthur had expressed his wish that the occupation proceed without incident, and, to forestall any bloodshed, Emperor Hirohito issued a rescript ordering his people to accept their fate.

Preparations for the vast landing operation went ahead, delayed temporarily by the threat of a typhoon. The plan was to have the greatest show of strength possible at the scene of the Japanese surrender. The results were impressive. On August 26, the advance guard of the Navy started to move into Sagami Bay. Guides and interpreters were taken aboard from a little Japanese destroyer and two days later the mighty Third Fleet steamed on past Yokosuka and into Tokyo Bay itself. There it lay, at anchor, the living proof of the thoroughness of Japanese defeat. Fleet Admiral Nimitz had assembled 401 ships, 383 American and 18 British. They included all classes, from the 45,000 ton battleship *Missouri*, flagship of the Third Fleet, to tankers, tenders and landing craft. Overhead thundered an umbrella of 1,200 carrier planes, on guard against a last suicide plunge of Kamikaze planes. The stage was set for the final scene.

On August 30, General Douglas MacArthur arrived on the Japanese mainland. For the first time the Japanese nation would see the man who had been chosen to rule them in the difficult months ahead. Whatever they thought of him, the choice was generally approved by American and Allied public and official opinion. Through the dark years of the Pacific war, General MacArthur had remained a dashing, popular, inspiring figure. His training and his experience fitted him for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the monumental task ahead, for he had spent many years in the Far East and made a special study of the Japanese war machine. In his position, first as Army Chief of Staff and later as Field Marshal of the Philippine Commonwealth, he had become accustomed to dealing with civilian officials, a very important phase of his job in Japan.

THE TASK AHEAD

In many ways, General MacArthur's task would be far more difficult than that faced in Germany. Like Germany, the Japanese Empire has been drastically shrunk by the terms of the Potsdam declaration. She will, in fact, be confined to the main home islands. Thus will arise the problem of feeding an over-populated nation on the yield of the unproductive Japanese soil. There will also be the psychological problem of occupying a nation which has never felt the conqueror's heel and which can still boast a technically undefeated army of more than 2,000,000 men. Although reports at present conflict on the attitude of the general public, some claiming that the people are sullen, others that they are friendly and fawning, there is no doubt that the ultimate attitude will be influenced by that of the returning soldiers. As long as they remain convinced, as they are at present, that it was the sudden scientific stride of the United States in the development of the atomic bomb that defeated them, rather than superior fighting, the militaristic spirit will not die. MacArthur's second task, then, will be to impress on the people the fact that the Japanese Army and Navy were defeated before the first use of the atom bomb, that this merely hastened and sealed their doom. Thirdly, he will have to set in motion plans for changing an economy geared to total war, to one which can operate on a peacetime basis. This task has already been partly accomplished by the destruction of many of Japan's large industrial centers, leaving her with only about 50 percent of her pre-war heavy industry. Furthermore, Japan's lack of merchant shipping will make it virtually impossible for her to bring in the necessary raw materials, or to export any surplus products. All in all, Japan's economic situation looks very black indeed.

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED

If he had any misgivings over the size of his job, Douglas MacArthur did not show it as he arrived on the *Missouri* to take charge of the formal signing of the surrender. The surrender ceremony itself was simple. There were two copies of the document, one bound in green for the United States, the other in black (the Japanese ceremonial color) for the enemy. General MacArthur and Admirals Nimitz and Halsey boarded the *Missouri* at 8:45. The Japanese delegation, headed by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Foreign Minister Mamoru Shigemitsu and General Yoshijiro Umezu, chief of the Imperial General Staff, arrived 15 minutes later. There were no ceremonious preliminaries. General MacArthur stepped to the microphone and announced, simply: "I now invite the representatives of the Emperor of Japan and the Japanese Government and the Japanese Imperial General Headquarters to sign the instrument of surrender at the places designated."

When they had finished signing, MacArthur, flanked by Lieutenant General Jonathan M. Wainwright, defender of Bataan and Lieutenant General Arthur E. Percival, commander of Singapore, stepped to the table. "The Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers" signed the historic document with five pens. The first two he gave to Generals Wainwright and Percival, the others will go to West Point, the national archives and to Mrs. MacArthur. Admiral Nimitz then signed for the United States, followed by representatives of the United Kingdom, China, Russia, Australia, Canada, France, the Netherlands and New Zealand. Immediately after the signing, the Japanese delegation left the ship.

To a waiting world, General MacArthur addressed these parting words: "And so, my fellow countrymen, today I report to you that your sons and daughters have served you well and faithfully. . . . They are homeward bound. Take care of them."

The International Front

WHITHER ASIA?

With the downfall of the Co-Prosperity Sphere of Greater Asia, a vacuum was created, but one which was being rapidly filled as the powers recovered from the shock of sudden victory. The most interesting news came out of Chungking on August 26, when the terms of a Russo-Chinese pact dealing with the disposition of Outer Mongolia, Manchuria and various economic interests, were announced. The treaty was in the nature of a compromise. The Soviet Union pledged itself to respect the territorial integrity of China and to give moral and material aid to the government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek. It recognized, further, China's sovereignty over Manchuria. In return for this, Russia exacted her price—Soviet domination of Korea, joint control of the Chinese Eastern and South Manchurian railroads, the use of the ports at Dairen and Port Arthur, withdrawal of Chinese claims to Outer Mongolia. This virtually placed Russia in her pre-1905 position in Eastern Asia. One the other hand, it gave greater promise of peace and stability in China by weakening the power of Mao Tze-tung, Chinese Communist leader, who was forced to go to Chungking and settle his differences with his erstwhile chief, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"THE SUN NEVER SETS . . . "

British troops re-entered the crown colony of Hong Kong early in September. Momentarily it appeared as though there would be an international incident, for an announcement had come out of Chungking earlier that, since Hong Kong lay within China's military zone, Chinese troops would occupy it. Britain protested sharply and there was a hurried conference. Discreetly, China withdrew her claim.

TOWARD GREATER INDEPENDENCE

While Great Britain attempted to hold the line in her colonial possessions, there were little flare-ups of revolt among her dominions. The growing importance of these areas, particularly during the war, was making them conscious of the weight they carried. Australia's outspoken foreign secretary Evatt declared that Australia had been slighted in the surrender of Japan, that she was entitled to separate representation at the preliminary negotiations.

A few weeks later, our neighbor to the north announced that the Canadian Parliament was planning to sponsor a whole new set of national symbols, thus emphasizing Canada's growing spirit of independence. Among the symbols were to be a new Dominion flag and a new anthem, probably "O Canada."

CARRYING ON

Across the globe, in Great Britain, the new Labor government was getting under way and people who had been shouting: "Radical!" began to regret their hasty conclusions. Indeed, there was little in Foreign Secretary Bevin's maiden speech to Parliament that indicated a deviation from the path charted by Churchill and Eden. Bevin made his point clearly: "One thing we must aim at resolutely . . . is to prevent the substitution of one form of totalitarianism for another" in the liberated countries. The foreign secretary became more specific. He singled out Rumania, Hungary and Bulgaria as examples of "government which have been set up (and) do not in our view represent the majority of the people." He pledged continued support to the present shaky regime in Greece.

SOUTH OF THE BORDER

A sharper policy toward Argentina was indicated by a shift in the State Department when Nelson Rockefeller resigned his post as Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Latin American affairs and was replaced by Spruille Braden, present ambassador to Argentina. In a speech on August 24, Rockefeller declared that the Farrell regime had not kept its promises and implied that a sterner policy was in order. Mr. Braden, with long experience in Latin American affairs, has been chosen because his tough attitude toward Farrell's colonels has been favorably observed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Home Front

"The way to get going is to get going." That's the way James Krug, boss of the WPB, put it as the nation's industry faced the monumental task of reconverting to peacetime industry. It was a job to be tackled immediately, if predictions of 5,000,000 unemployed by Christmas were to be proved incorrect. Already, large-scale lay-offs and the threat of more were endangering the delicate balance of peace on the labor front that had been precariously maintained throughout the war. In the wake of victory celebrations came that blank, "where do we go from here" sensation. Government and industry, partly recovered from the shock of sudden peace, announced the lifting of restrictions on production that immeasurably brightened the picture. Automobiles, they declared, would soon roll off the production lines in large numbers—600,000 by the end of this year, and 3,000,000 more in 1946. To a gadget-conscious nation, other announcements were music to the ear. In the immediate future, electrical appliances, radios, cameras, etc., would all appear again on the empty shelves of the nation's dealers.

Nor were the housewives of the nation forgotten. Canned goods went off the ration lists, meat would probably follow in the fall and only sugar looked like a long-term problem. Other products that would soon flow into the civilian market were shoes, clothing, telephones, fuel. And best of all, in this nation of confirmed pleasure drivers, gas was finally free to flow from the dry pumps of the nation once again to the tune of "Fill 'er up!" and the end of the tire rationing seemed just around the corner.

LEND-LEASE

While the people of this nation looked forward with pleased anticipation to the wonders of modern science and industry which would soon materialize, the reconversion plans of our British allies were given a rude set-back when, on August 21, President Truman announced the end of Lend-Lease. To date, the United States had supplied approximately $40,000,000,00 worth of food, weapons and other materials to her allies, with the specific understanding that this type of aid would end with the war.

Yet, in spite of the specific provisions of the law, China had already asked for a one-year extension, Russia had put in a bid for $6,000,000,000 in post-war credits and other allies had strongly hinted that they hoped the free flow of aid would continue. This aid will now have to be sought elsewhere, presumably from the Export-Import Bank, at regular interest rates. President Truman's move received enthusiastic support throughout the nation.

Then the President tossed a second bombshell when, a week later, he declared that the "overwhelming portion of the "Lend-Lease" debt

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should be wiped from the nation's books. Public comment on this was less favorable and astute Jimmy Byrnes hastened to qualify his chief's statement, declaring: "Nothing more should be read into the . . . Lend-Lease report than is written there . . . In the settlement of Lend-Lease we are not seeking paper contracts to pay dollars which will not be available to our debtors. But that does not mean that there are no Lend-Lease settlements to be negotiated." This was as much to silence angry rumblings on Capitol Hill as to re-assure the nation.

"REMEMBER PEARL HARBOR — "

Simultaneously with the landing of American troops in Japan came the release of reports, which, marked "secret," had been kept under cover for over a year. In more than 130,000 words, Army and Navy Boards had set down their findings on the events that led up to that fateful day when the bulk of our fleet lay in smoking ruin in Pearl Harbor. The cumulative effect of the reports was one of buck-passing and the confused text bore ample witness to the confused situation it was attempting to explain. Neither Admiral Kimmel nor General Short was exonerated, but they were joined in the brass-hat doghouse by no less a person than Chief of Staff General Marshall as well as by Lieutenant General Gerow and Admiral Stark. Nor was ex-Secretary of State Cordell Hull spared.

Of the two reports, that of the Navy Board was relatively mild. It would, in fact, have exonerated Admiral Kimmel, had not Admiral King and Navy Secretary Forrestal dissented and declared that Kimmel had adequate information on which to base greater precautions than he had taken. Under the circumstances, both Stark and Kimmel were guilty of "faults of omission" and were declared unfit to hold "any position in the U. S. Navy which requires the exercise of superior judgment."

The army report told a sterner tale—of delay, incompetence, general lack of co-ordination. It characterized the Hawaiian Command as being completely unaware of the gravity of the situation, enumerating specifically: 1) the failure to increase military installations; 2) the failure to disperse planes which, at the time of the Japanese attack, stood wing to wing on Hickman Field; 3) the failure properly to man existing air-raid warning stations—radar stations were manned only from 4:00 a.m. to 7:00 a.m.; 4) the failure to have the artillery supplied with ammunition—Ordnance "did not want to issue any of the clean ammunition, let it out and get it dirty, have to take it back later on and renovate it."

Other departments of the government were involved too. The army report singled out Hull, as not having kept the military leaders informed on the progress of diplomatic negotiations. Even the Department of the Interior was charged with having made it too difficult for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the military to use the National Parks for military purposes.

The public, as reflected by newspaper comment (pp. 182-185 of this issue), was not pleased with the reports. In spite of the volume of the material, said some, the reports actually came to no conclusion. Others objected to the intimation that the entire public was to blame for the disaster. All agreed that it would be wise to "remember Pearl Harbor" for future reference, for it is doubtful that we would be spared the consequences of such colossal blundering twice.

STATE DEPARTMENT SHAKE-UP

Twice in nine months the State Department has put in a new team. Joseph C. Grew, Julius C. Holmes and Archibald MacLeish, who came in with Secretary Stettinius, went out. James Byrnes' first appointment was Dean Acheson as the new Under Secretary. The latter, who has been in the State Department since 1941 as Assistant Secretary, has been primarily concerned with economic matters, including work on Lend-Lease and the planning of the UNRRA.

LE GRAND CHARLIE

Bearing gifts and decorations, General Charles de Gaulle, President of the Provisional Government of France, came to pay his second visit to the White House. But it was not the same man who had met the cool reserve of the late President Roosevelt's greeting with his own icy hauteur. Indeed, he more than matched the cordiality of President Truman's greeting. Nor did the President's criticism of the French press cause DeGaulle to withdraw into his shell. On the contrary, he countered Mr. Truman's statements with a sly dig at the American press—all of course, in a spirit of mutual understanding. In general it was agreed that Charles De Gaulle had made a favorable impression on this second visit to the United States.

* * *

● A harrassed diner kept a wisecrack to himself for 1,345 days, and when he finally could use it, the waitress had no comeback. When he ordered a hamburger, only to be told it was meatless Tuesday, he said, "My gosh, you'd think there was a war on!"

* * *

● A small town abstract company, next door to a tavern, got tired of trying to sell abstracts to persons who came to their office looking for beer. They solved their problem by hanging a sign on the door which read: No beer here, but beer near here."

* * *

● "I have concluded that the chief qualification to be head of a bank is a constitutional inability to grasp a new idea."

—A banker testified before a Senate Committee

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—continued from other side

it, no more than the publisher's retail price, and frequently much less. (A small charge is added to cover postage and other mailing expenses.)

As a member you receive a careful pre-publication report about each book-of-the-month (and at the same time reports about all other important new books). If you want the book-of-the-month, you let it come. If not, you specify some other book you want, or simply write, "Send me nothing." With every two books-of-the-month you buy, you receive, free, a valuable book dividend. Last year the retail value of books given to Club members was over $9,000,000.

Your only obligation as a member is to buy no fewer than four books-of-the-month in any twelve-month period, and you can cancel your subscription any time after doing so. (*Prices are slightly higher in Canada.*)

and receive a FREE copy—as a new member—of

BRAVE MEN

BY ERNIE PYLE

"First-hand reporting which can never be equalled by stories told afterwards"

TEAR OFF AND MAIL THIS POSTCARD

•

NO STAMP NEEDED

•

SEE OTHER SIDE

BOOK-OF-THE-MONTH CLUB A14211

385 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.

Please enroll me as a member. I am to receive a free copy of BRAVE MEN, and for every two books-of-the-month I purchase from the Club I am to receive, free, the current book-dividend then being distributed. I agree to purchase at least four books-of-the-month from the Club each full year. I am a member, and I may cancel my subscription any time after purchasing four such books from the Club.

Name _____
Please Print Plainly

Address _____

City _____ Postal District No. (if any) _____ *State* _____

☐ **IMPORTANT:** Please check here if you do NOT want us to begin your subscription with the current double-selection, *Up Front* and *The World, The Flesh and Father Smith.* The price of the two books, to members only, is $3.00.

Book prices are slightly higher in Canada but the Club ships to Canadian members, without any extra charge for duty, through Book-of-the-Month Club (Canada), Ltd.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Begin your subscription to the **BOOK-OF-THE-MONTH CLU**

with this remarkable Double selection

COMBINED PRICE TO MEMBERS $3.00

UP FRONT

By Bill Mauldin

BILL MAULDIN

and

BRUCE MARSHALL

THE WORLD, THE FLESH AND FATHER SMITH

By Bruce Marshall

TO JOIN THE BOOK-OF-THE-MONTH CLUB

SIGNING and mailing the coupon enrolls you. You pay no fixed sum as a member and obligate yourself for no fixed term. *You pay for each book as you receive* **—continued on other side**

FIRST CLASS
Permit No. 419
(Sec. 510 PL&R)
New York, N. Y.

BUSINESS REPLY CARD
(No Postage Stamp Necessary if Mailed In the United States)

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY

BOOK-OF-THE-MONTH CLUB, INC.

385 MADISON AVENUE

NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

FREE

TO NEW MEMBE

BRAVE MEN

BY ERNIE PY

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED